



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2013

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 10th anniversary of the unnecessary war in Iraq. I urge my fellow Members and the American public to watch MSNBC's documentary, "Hubris: The Selling of the Iraq War," on Friday night of this week at 9 o'clock. The documentary sheds light on the manipulated intelligence that got us into Iraq.

Unfortunately, we have not learned from all we lost in Iraq, as President

Obama has also committed us to an additional 10 years in Afghanistan thanks to a strategic security agreement he made without Congress voting on it or even debating it.

This weekend I read two articles that really spoke to the corruption happening in Afghanistan. One was an AP article I read in my hometown paper titled: "U.S. Helicopter Crashes in Afghanistan Killing One." And the other is from The New York Times titled: "Afghans Protest U.S. Special Forces: Complaints about Night Raids Sparked Cause for Withdrawal."

I will quote from the first article:

The crashes come as United States officials are grappling with tough talk from President Hamid Karzai whose recent anti-American rhetoric has complicated relations at a time when international troops are withdrawing from the war.

The article continues saying:

Karzai started the week by accusing the United States and the Taliban of being in collusion on two deadly suicide bombings last weekend in an effort to create instability and give security forces an excuse to stay.

Karzai is one person we cannot trust, and yet we are funding him \$8 billion a month. The New York Times article states that Karzai issued a statement that "referred to U.S. forces in Afghanistan as 'infidels,'" echoing language used by the Taliban.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not understand why more Members of the House are not more concerned about President Obama's 10-year security agreement to keep our troops in Afghanistan until 2024—10 more years after 2014—2024. It makes absolutely no sense. We are financially broke as a Nation.

I am currently in the process of finding out exactly how much money it is going to cost the American taxpayer to keep our troops in this corrupt country for another decade past 2014. Whether the cost is \$1 or \$1 trillion is too much.

Congresswoman ROSA DELAUNO and I have introduced H.R. 125, the Congress-

sional Oversight of Afghanistan Agreement Act of 2013, to make sure that the President does not bypass Congress as he continues to do, but gives us a chance to debate any security agreement that will keep our troops in Afghanistan past 2014.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job as Representatives to make sure the voices of the American people are being heard, and it is only fair that we have a debate in Congress on how long our country's future involvement with Afghanistan will continue.

Mr. Speaker, as always, I bring down a poster that shows the cost of war. In this case, you can see these marines, Mr. Speaker, carrying a coffin, a flag-draped coffin. How many more coffins have to be carried by the soldiers and the marines and the airmen and the Navy of this country when the American people demand that Congress pull our troops out of Afghanistan? It is too long to be there until 2014; it is too long to be there until 2024.

May God bless our men and women in uniform, and God please wake up Congress to bring our troops home.

10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, although I rise to honor the 10th anniversary of the Iraq war, what I really want to do today is ask: Why? Ten years ago, I stood on this floor and said we were entering a war under false pretenses. No weapons of mass destruction later, I have never been so sad as to be right.

We took out Saddam Hussein with as much forethought as we gave to arming him just a few years earlier. We scooped him out of office and thought a new democracy would suddenly flower in its place.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1571

Last week, Robert Dreyfuss wrote an article in *The Nation* that I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He explains that the CIA is currently training Syrian rebels, some of whom have Sunni fundamentalist ties, at the same time that it is fighting Sunni rebels in Iraq. Recently, dozens of Syrian soldiers fled to Iraq, only to be killed by Iraqi Sunnis. He asked the question:

When will the United States learn that it doesn't know enough about the Middle East to go charging in there, seemingly without a clue about what it all means?

So here we are: 10 years of neoconservative hawks preaching that we can franchise American democracy and freedom; 10 years of quicksand diplomacy; 10 years of wrong answers, and we still don't know the question.

What has been the cost of all of this? And I don't mean financially. Because, yes, we've spent probably a trillion or more on this war, or will. Yes, as we speak, we are cutting food assistance to kids in this country and funding for R&D that would drive our economy. But we can't appropriate a sum of money to fix the real cost of Iraq. We can't pay back the lives of 4,486 American men and women who have died there, or the roughly 2,000 broken soldiers who came home and took their own lives.

The wounded—physically and mentally. The soldiers who didn't know how not to be a soldier. The families living with a hole in their hearts, and the families living with someone they no longer recognize. Ten years of young men and women leaving their families, living in hell, and coming home to unemployment and to homelessness. To a country that has forgotten it's at war at all. To a country that seems to think a yellow ribbon magnet on their bumper is the only kind of support that our troops need.

And the cost in Iraq? Untold deaths. Let me rephrase that: unknown deaths. We can only guess at the destruction that we have left in our wake: 115,000 Iraqis? 600,000? You can find a number. What was the long-term impact of that on their environment, water, and health. What happens when someone lives in constant fear of becoming collateral damage?

Today, Iraq is a sad shadow of a society that once boasted the best infrastructure in the region. Instability and violence fester on this very day, and now it teeters on the brink of an inevitable civil war.

This is the legacy of our last 10 years, and I still don't understand why. I hope this anniversary will remind us that a whole new generation of veterans are waiting to help reintegrate into civilian life. I believe it's time to elevate our level of commitment to these veterans.

I am introducing a bill to create a commission on veterans care to investigate what we as a society can do to help our men and women come home. I hope it will remind us that no lives, re-

gardless of nationality, should be taken lightly. I hope it will remind us as to why the next time. And I hope it won't take another war to get that answer.

THE CIA TAKES OPPOSITE SIDES IN SYRIA AND IRAQ

Mr. McDERMOTT. What, really, could be more bizarre than this: as the United States ramps up its aid to Syria's ragtag rebels, whose backbone is comprised of radical Islamists and Sunni fundamentalists, some with ties to Al Qaeda, the CIA is busily engaged in combat inside Iraq with the very same radical Islamists and Sunni fundamentalists, some with ties to Al Qaeda.

Yep, that's right.

We're backing the same guys in Syria that we're fighting in Iraq.

Of course, we shouldn't be involved in Iraq in any way, shape or form, but try telling that to the CIA. According to the *Wall Street Journal*:

The Central Intelligence Agency is ramping up support to elite Iraqi antiterrorism units to better fight al Qaeda affiliates, amid alarm in Washington about spillover from the civil war in neighboring Syria, according to US officials.

The stepped-up mission expands a covert US presence on the edges of the two-year-old Syrian conflict, at a time of American concerns about the growing power of extremists in the Syrian rebellion.

The *Journal* notes that this isn't an accident. It was the result of a carefully thought-out White House decision:

In a series of secret decisions from 2011 to late 2012, the White House directed the CIA to provide support to Iraq's Counterterrorism Service, or CTS, a force that reports directly to Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, officials said.

The CIA has since ramped up its work with the CTS—taking control of a mission long run by the U.S. military, according to administration and defense officials. For years, U.S. special-operations forces worked with CTS against al Qaeda in Iraq. But the military's role has dwindled since U.S. troops pulled out of the country at the end of 2011.

The paradox, obviously, is that Maliki, the guy we're helping in Iraq, is an ally of Iran's and is sympathetic to President Assad of Syria. That's because were the Sunni-led rebels in Syria to seize Damascus and topple Assad, they'd turn their wrath next door against the Shiite-led Maliki regime, and funnel weapons and fighters to support the Sunni-led rebels in Iraq.

That's not stopping the United States, though, from boosting the fortunes of the Syrian rebels by funneling aid and support to them and coordinating the flow of weapons from Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey. Meanwhile, as *The New York Times* has been reporting for a while, the same CIA that is trying to squash the Sunni rebels in Iraq is actually training Sunni rebels in a secret program in Jordan, to fight in Syria.

Oddly enough, the rest of the media hasn't picked up on the *Times* reports on the CIA training efforts in Jordan, and the *Times* itself hasn't elaborated. How many gangsters are in the CIA training in Jordan? What are they doing?

It all comes together in the recent reports that dozens of Syrian soldiers, loyal to Assad, who fled into Iraq recently, were then massacred by Iraqi Sunni crazies.

We blundered, bungling, into Iraq in 2003 without knowing really a damn thing about the country we invaded. When will the United States learn that it doesn't know enough about the Middle East to go charging in there with guns, seemingly without a clue about what it all means?

□ 1010

A CALL FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I arrived here in Washington, D.C., to serve the people of Montana and my country with a bit of a different resume than many folks have here in Washington. You see, I've spent the past 28 years in the private sector working to grow businesses, having to balance a budget and create good jobs.

I loved my job in the private sector. But when I looked at Washington and the path our economy and our country was on, I knew that things needed to change. So I ran for Congress because the challenges facing our Nation were far too great to just sit back on the sidelines.

As Montana's small businesses know, you can't spend more than you take in. Year after year of Federal deficits with no end in sight doesn't lead to prosperity, doesn't lead to growth—it leads to financial ruin.

I'm also the father of four great kids—two in college and two in high school. They know that as a family, we have to plan ahead for the future. We need to create a budget and then live within our means. These are the same principles that my parents passed down to me. These are the values that Montana families live by each and every day.

Those values are exemplified in Montana's own State legislature, where the only constitutionally required duty is passing a balanced budget. In fact, when our legislature in Montana adjourns in just a little over a month, they will have given Montana a balanced budget, just like they did last year and the year before and the year before that. It seems simple: live within your means and spend no more than you take in. But it's not so easy here in Washington.

Right now we're presented with two very different visions for our country, two visions that will lead to two very different outcomes for this country.

One vision calls for more taxes taken out of the pockets of hardworking American families and more government spending, which adds to the trillions of dollars in debt that will be handed down to the next generation.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about a balanced approach, but they refuse to even balance their own budget.

Our vision calls for a stop to Washington's failed policies and reckless spending. It says American families and small businesses understand you can't spend more than you take in, that you need to balance your budget. It's time for Washington to do the same.

This vision seeks to protect the things that we value most, to keep the promises that we've made to our seniors and to our veterans—I'm the son of a U.S. Marine—while at the same time allowing us to leave a better future to our kids and our grandkids. That's the vision I want to work toward, and that's why I'm proud to support the House Budget Committee's proposals which we will be voting on later this week.

This isn't about passing a budget for one year just one time. This is about creating lasting solutions that help grow our economy and put our country back on track. That's what this budget will do.

SAVING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, as I speak here on the floor, the American Society of Civil Engineers is releasing a report card for America's infrastructure.

The gentleman who spoke before me talked about the legacy that we leave to our country and about growth in the Nation. Well, this is an incredible legacy we're leaving and creating, which is an unbelievable deficit in our Nation's infrastructure. We've gone from No. 1 in the world post-World War II with the Eisenhower era, the national interstate program, to No. 26 in the world. We are spending less of our gross domestic product on infrastructure investment than many Third World countries. It's not only an embarrassment; it is hurting our economy and our growth.

Now, if your kid came home and said, Hey, Dad, guess what? I got my report card. Here it is. Good news. Good news. Oh, it's good news. I went up to a D-plus. A D-plus—that's where America's infrastructure is.

We have a projected deficit over the next 7 years of about \$1.6 trillion. That's an unbelievable, unimaginable number, \$1.6 trillion. That's as much money as the war in Iraq cost us, an unnecessary and wasteful war. We can't afford to invest in our infrastructure, but we're rebuilding the infrastructure in Afghanistan. There's something wrong with this picture.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, if we don't address this investment gap in all of our infrastructure, by 2020 the economy will lose \$1 trillion in business sales, 3.5 million jobs will be lost or foregone and there will be \$3.1 trillion less in gross domestic product. If we invested \$1.6 trillion, we would get 100 percent return on our investment and 3.5 million more jobs. Not bad, but the people on that side of the aisle don't believe in rebuilding America's infrastructure. They have some wacko theory here of what they call "devolution." We shouldn't have a national transportation policy, no. It should be done by the 50 States. Well, we already tried that. It didn't work too well. That's when Dwight David Eisenhower said we needed an national interstate system, and we built it. Now it's falling apart.

There are 140,000 bridges that need substantial repair or replacement and 40 percent of the pavement on the National Highway System is at the point where there are potholes big enough to put your car in. Maybe if the White House limousine falls in one of those holes we'll get a little more action down there in terms of funding our infrastructure. I've been trying to get them to take a position on this.

We are looking at something even more extraordinary. In 2015—we've been paying for infrastructure out of a trust fund. It hasn't added to the deficit. But it raises taxes. Oh, my God. We can't have taxes for something like that, can we? Not on that side of aisle.

Well, if we don't do something about it, the trust fund is going to drop below zero sometime in 2014, which means we are not going to invest any more in our National Transportation System. For one year we'll go from \$50 billion, which is not sufficient to even deal with the deterioration, let alone build out a better, more efficient 21st century infrastructure, to \$7 billion. That's hundreds of thousands of jobs gone. That's an acceleration in the deterioration of the system.

We're going to have to talk about revenues. It's the only way to solve that problem, unless you want to devolve it to the 50 States and have the States build interstates that don't match up or maybe they won't build the interstates at all. We don't know what kind of plan is coming from that side of the aisle. But I do know that we need to make these investments. As I already pointed out, we can get a 100 percent rate of return.

It's pretty simple. We would just index the existing gas tax, which hasn't changed since 1993. Yeah, we're paying nearly 4 bucks a gallon. It will be 5 bucks a gallon by Memorial Day. And the money is going into the coffers of ExxonMobil and the other big oil companies. It isn't going to repair infrastructure.

We haven't raised that tax in 20 years. If we just indexed it to construction cost inflation and indexed it to fleet fuel economy, we could issue

bonds paid off by that increment on the gas tax. It would be about a penny a year a gallon. When I was driving to work one day and they were changing the cards up there, they were raising it a nickel a gallon just as I drove by. At a penny a gallon, I think most Americans would be willing to pay for that if they knew it was going to save 3.5 or create 3.5 million jobs and put this country back on track and get rid of some of the delays and the congestion and the detours and all the other problems we have.

So let's pay attention to this scorecard, to this report card. If your kid came home with a card like this, you'd do something about it. Congress better do something about it.

DONALD FOISIE—1ST CALVARY DIVISION
SOLDIER—PATRIOT—
TEXAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was June 1950 when the North Koreans decided they would invade their neighbors to the south, South Korea. The war had started—even though the world community called it a "police action"—but it was a war, and of course South Korea was in trouble. They called 911, and as it has been in history, when you call 911, the United States answers. The Americans went to South Korea to protect our ally South Korea.

In August of the same year, some Americans were occupying Hill 303. Most Americans have never heard of Hill 303. Let me tell you about it.

Hill 303 was being occupied by the 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division of the United States Army. It was a small group because America didn't have a lot of troops in South Korea. We weren't ready for this war. The North Koreans, with the aid of the Communist Chinese later, overran the hill—and the Americans, some stayed, some withdrew. One of the individuals who stayed on that hill was a friend of mine by the name of Donald Foisie.

Donald Foisie and his other comrades refused to give ground. The hill was overrun. The North Koreans took the hill. Donald Foisie and one of his friends hid in a rice paddy. They used bamboo canes to get air, and they stayed there for a long time. Unbeknownst to him, 45 other American soldiers had been captured by the North Koreans. And after they were captured, they were lined up in front of a ditch, with their hands tied behind their backs, and they were machine-gunned down in that gully. Later, the Americans retook the hill. They found Donald Foisie and found his murdered comrades.

That was in August of 1950. Things haven't changed much in the Koreas. The North Koreans still have sights on South Korea, but that's another story.

Sergeant Donald Foisie was wounded several times, and received the Purple Heart that day. He stayed in the United States Army until 1962. He came back to Atascocita, Texas—down the street from me—and he had several businesses. He worked for a corporation in Houston. That corporation was an international corporation, and from time to time they would fly the flag of the country that they were hosting that day. When Donald Foisie saw that one of those flags, on one day that he was working, was the Red Chinese—as he called them—Communist flag, he refused to go to work. He didn't believe that the Chinese flag ought to fly on American soil. That's the kind of guy he was.

He spent the rest of his life letting Americans know about the Korean war. Last year, he was at Creekwood Middle School in Kingwood, Texas where the Creekwood Middle School kids honored the veterans of Hill 303—those who were murdered—and had a memorial. He was there, along with many South Koreans, and Ambassador Park from South Korea and myself were there.

Last year, he also attended the Memorial Day service at the veterans cemetery in Houston, and this is where that photograph was taken. He was saluting a crowd of several thousand who had given him a standing ovation after his story was told. You see, he looks pretty good. He's 81 in this photograph. This week, Donald Foisie, United States Army, 1st Cavalry Division—he's still wearing his hat—died. He will be buried this Friday at this same cemetery that he was standing in and honoring on Memorial Day.

He was quite a guy. He was married to Rita for 60 years. He had three kids—Donna, Daniel, and David. He wrote several books. He was in the air-conditioning business, and he worked as a security guard when his knees got bad. But he spent most of his life letting America know about his buddies in Korea in 1950—"the forgotten war," as he called it. He wants us to remember what occurred many years ago when young Americans—kids—went over to lands they'd never seen and fought for people they had never known, all in the name of securing liberty and America's interest.

So, today, we honor Sergeant Foisie and his family for his service in the United States Army, for being a true patriot, a true American, a great Texan, and a person who never gave ground.

And that's just the way it is.

10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Today is a solemn anniversary, a tragedy that began 10 years ago when President George W. Bush launched a war of choice in Iraq, driving our country into a costly, bit-

ter conflict based on falsehoods and hyperbole. It took President Obama's fulfilling his campaign promise to end the Iraq war, and we are grateful that he brought the war to an end, but we must not forget how we got into the war in the first place so that these mistakes are not repeated.

We were told there were weapons of mass destruction. We were warned about mushroom clouds. Now, I offered an amendment at the time that would have taken us down a different path. It would have required the United States to work through the United Nations, using inspectors and maximizing diplomacy and inspections to determine whether or not Iraq was developing weapons of mass destruction. Unfortunately, my amendment failed by a vote of 72–355.

What happened from there? We all know the tragic consequences: President Bush dragged this country into an unnecessary war. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found. The costs of the Iraq war soared far beyond what was projected, and we lost 4,400 American troops in Iraq, and over 32,000 were wounded, not to mention Iraqis.

Once the war started, many of us in Congress quickly organized. Led by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and my good friend former Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey and myself, we founded the Out of Iraq Caucus. Over 80 Members joined. Thankfully, on May 25, 2005, Congresswoman Woolsey introduced the first amendment to bring our troops home. From what I remember, there were about 132 votes that that amendment received, but that was not enough to stop the war. It was our way, though, to join the hundreds of thousands of people who marched and protested against what they knew was a war based on misleading information by the Bush administration. Many in this House supported my amendment every year to cut the funding for combat operations and to only appropriate funding for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops and our contractors.

Now, we would have saved hundreds of lives had this body used the power of the purse strings to stop this war. Shame on us. Ten years later, today, the full consequences and costs of the Iraq war remain to be seen.

According to a new study by the Watson Institute at Brown University, the war in Iraq has cost \$1.7 trillion, with an additional \$490 billion in benefits owed to our veterans. Most importantly, we paid for this war most tragically in loss of life and injury, and we poured billions of dollars into nation-building in Iraq with little oversight or accountability. The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction issued his final report to Congress last month, detailing the billions of United States tax dollars lost to waste, fraud, and abuse.

Speaking with an Iraqi official, Special Inspector Stuart Bowen was told: You can fly in a helicopter around

Baghdad and other cities, but you cannot point a finger to a single project that was built and completed by the United States.

Unfortunately, these lost opportunities and tragic mistakes are not behind us. As the daughter of a 25-year veteran of the Armed Forces, I recognize the sacrifices our young men and women have made in Iraq and continue to make in Afghanistan. I am deeply concerned with the widespread incidences of PTSD and the alarming suicide rates among our returning veterans. We need to honor our troops who served and show our support by giving our men and women who served the best health care, the best educational opportunities and the best jobs available. They deserve nothing less.

It is my hope that this reckless and shortsighted decision will mark a turning point in American history and that we will never again wage an unnecessary war. We must use all the tools of American power in resolving disputes, including diplomacy, and we must have sufficient congressional debate. We only debated this go-to-war resolution for probably a couple of hours. We need more debate and oversight before ever putting another U.S. soldier in harm's way.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, just like in Iraq, there is no military solution in Afghanistan. We need to bring the war in Afghanistan to an accelerated end and bring our troops home now. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in expressing his sentiment during a different war, said: The bombs in Vietnam explode at home—they destroy the hopes and possibilities of a decent America.

So let us put this decade of perpetual warfare behind us, invest in our veterans, our children, and get about the business of nation-building here at home.

□ 1030

CONGRATULATING DR. JOSEPH SCHRODT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every time I walk onto this floor, it is such an honor and a privilege to be able to represent the great citizens of central and southwestern Illinois, the citizens that have given me this opportunity that humbles me every time we walk through those doors and every time we are able to stand here in this institution and offer what our visions for America are. There are vast differences in our visions for America between many parties. Fortunately, though, there are a lot of similarities and our willingness to begin working together to craft a vision for America that the hardworking taxpayers of this country want and deserve.

But another great honor that this institution allows is to actually honor

some of those hardworking taxpayers in our district on a regular basis. It gives us an opportunity to talk about the many things that those in our districts do on a regular basis. They don't ask for recognition; they just do it because it is the right thing to do.

And that's why today I stand here, Mr. Speaker. I want to congratulate Dr. Joseph Schrodtt of Decatur, Illinois, for being honored by the American Medical Association for his 50-year anniversary of graduation from medical school. While Dr. Schrodtt's dedication and commitment to the medical profession through the years is a tremendous accomplishment, I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to also thank Dr. Schrodtt for all he and his family have done for the entire Decatur area.

Dr. Schrodtt's contributions to the area are too many to mention, but his advocacy and hard work on behalf of students and education is something we should all strive to emulate. Whether it was his time spent serving on the board of my alma mater, Millikin University and their board of trustees, or the Richland Community College Foundation Board, or he and his late wife Martha's work to see the health education wing at Richland Community College come to fruition, Dr. Schrodtt's impact in the Decatur area will be felt for generations.

So I take this time today, Mr. Speaker, to offer my thanks to Dr. Schrodtt and his family for all that they have done and all that they continue to do, and offer my heartfelt congratulations to Dr. Schrodtt for this tremendous accomplishment.

THE RYAN BUDGET AND SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, budget resolutions are moral documents. They lay out a vision of how each party sees the future and where our priorities should lie. Since this is budget week, the week when we will vote on a number of different competing visions for America, it is the right time to talk about the misguided priorities laid out in the Republican budget as presented by Chairman PAUL RYAN.

Once again, Chairman RYAN has proposed a budget that guts low-income programs. The Ryan budget not only does not end hunger now, it actually makes hunger in America worse than it is today.

Simply put, we are currently not doing enough to end hunger now. There are over 50 million hungry Americans in this country; 17 million are kids. Over 47 million rely on SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, to put food on their tables. Without this program, real hunger—the actual absence of food—would be much worse.

The Great Recession is the primary reason hunger is so bad today. Now,

don't get me wrong; hunger has been getting worse since the Presidency of Ronald Reagan. We almost eradicated hunger in America in the late 1970s, but hunger has been getting steadily worse in the decades since. But the Great Recession, the worst economic period we've faced since the Great Depression, resulted in millions more hungry people, millions of people who had to turn to SNAP as the safety net that prevented them from going without food altogether.

Recognizing that hunger is a real problem and that we need to end hunger now, I would hope that any budget proposed in this Congress would, at the very least, do no harm to those who are struggling the most in our current economy. Yet the Ryan budget slashes SNAP once again. This should come as no surprise. This is basically the same budget he has introduced over the past few years—and the same budget that voters have rejected over and over again. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the same budget that turns Medicare into a voucher, the same budget that repeals the Affordable Care Act, and the same budget that gives even more tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. And, Mr. Speaker, it's the same budget that turns SNAP into a block grant.

Some of my Republican friends will provide false arguments about what the Ryan budget really does. They'll say that this just gives Governors flexibility, or they're just combating fraud, waste, and abuse. Mr. Speaker, the real goal of the Ryan budget, and of some of my Republican friends who support it, is to end SNAP as we know it.

SNAP is not just a simple antihunger program; it is among the more effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, Federal program. SNAP has a historically low error rate. Trafficking is going down, and prosecutions of SNAP trafficking are clearly visible as USDA works to reduce that problem. SNAP is a countercyclical program. That means that enrollment increases as the economy worsens. It is a true safety net program, and it has a side benefit of being a stimulus program. Every SNAP dollar spent results in another \$1.72 in economic activity.

Yes, SNAP can use some improving, but the wholesale and shortsighted changes included in the Ryan budget are not the answer. The Ryan budget actually cuts \$135 billion from SNAP over the next 10 years—\$135 billion. That's not a haircut; that's a meat-ax. It's an 18 percent cut, a cut that will cause real harm to low-income families who otherwise could not afford food.

The cuts in the Ryan budget will have a real impact on poor Americans and struggling working families because millions of people on SNAP work for a living. They earn so little that they still qualify for Federal assistance. If they apply these cuts solely to eligibility, these cuts would mean that 8 to 9 million people would be cut from SNAP. If these cuts are applied solely

to benefits, then all 47 million people on SNAP would see an average cut of \$24 per person per month. That adds up to a cut of almost \$1,100 per year for a family of four. That may not seem like much to a Congress that has a ton of millionaires, but a \$1,100 cut will do real, serious harm to people whose budgets are already stretched to the limit.

Cuts like these are not just misguided, they're cruel. Combined with cuts to other low-income programs that are included in the Ryan budget, these SNAP cuts will absolutely make hunger in America worse. As we consider a budget, at the very least, we should do no harm, but we really should be striving to make every American's life better. That's our job. Cutting SNAP not only doesn't make anybody's life better, it actually does real harm, harm that will manifest in a less educated population, a sicker Nation, and a Nation that ultimately has to spend more on the hungry simply because we decided to bring austerity to a program that doesn't deserve to be cut.

We are a great country, Mr. Speaker. We are great because we have a tradition of caring about the most vulnerable among us. Let us not turn our backs on one of our greatest traditions. This assault on poor people must come to an end. This assault on the hungry, many of whom are kids and senior citizens, must come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can end hunger now if we find the political will to do so. The Ryan budget does the opposite. It cuts a vital antihunger program for crass political reasons, an act that makes hunger worse. Let us instead pass a budget that lifts people up, not one that keeps people down.

DECISION TIME IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, this is decision time in America. We are at a fork in the road, and we have an opportunity to go in either one of two directions. In one direction, the Democratic approach, we can take a balanced approach to dealing with the economic situation that we find ourselves in and our deficit. The other direction, the GOP approach, is to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable amongst us. The Democratic plan will put Americans back to work. The Republican plan will put Americans out of work. It's decision time in America. We can go in one of two different directions.

Now, a balanced approach to deficit reduction has at least four elements to it:

First, invest in the American economy.

Second, increase revenues by closing corporate loopholes that are unfair, unreasonable, and unnecessary.

Third, we can reduce expenditures in a manner that is sensitive to the fragile nature of our economic recovery. We must reduce expenditures in a way that recognizes we still have a long way to go in order to recover, and the meat-cleaver approach advocated by my friends on the other side of the aisle will not make the decision better; it will just make the situation worse.

□ 1040

Lastly, the Democratic approach, the balanced approach, stands up for important social safety net programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid that have nothing to do with the economic situation that we find ourselves in right now.

Why should we invest in the American economy?

Well, we don't have an immediate deficit crisis in America right now. We've cut \$2.5 trillion from our deficit over the last several years; and we're prepared, on this side of the aisle, to reasonably do more.

But don't overhype the problem. In fact, objective economists have indicated we don't have an immediate deficit problem in America right now. The Speaker of the House of Representatives has conceded that we don't have an immediate deficit crisis in America right now.

Just on Sunday, the chairman of the Budget Committee acknowledged that we don't have an immediate deficit crisis in America right now. That's why we're pursuing a balanced approach.

What we do have is a jobs crisis. Over the last 4 years, under the leadership of President Obama, we have come a long way, almost 6 million private sector jobs added. But we still, of course, have a long way to go.

Let's just look at the landscape. Corporate profits are way up. The stock market is way up. The productivity of the American worker is way up. Yet unemployment remains stubbornly high, and consumer demand remains stagnant.

That's why the Democratic approach is to invest in our economy, invest in education, invest in job training, invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in research and development, invest in technology and innovation, invest in the things that will continue to make America a leader in the 21st century.

If you invest in our economy, then you will increase jobs for the American worker. If you increase the jobs available to the American worker, consumer demand will increase. If consumer demand increases, the economy will grow; and if the economy grows, the deficit will decline, and so, too, will our debt as a percentage of GDP.

This is decision time in America; and, clearly, the best decision that we can make is a balanced approach to dealing with our economic problems today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Alisa Lasater Wailoo, Capitol Hill United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As we begin our work today, we pause to give thanks for: each world leader, especially Pope Francis beginning his tenure today, each political party, each Congressperson and their staff, each individual citizen they represent, and all their diverse gifts and disparate needs.

As we begin our work here today, we ask You to reveal: where we've become desensitized to the struggles of Your children, where we've let pride prevent holy possibilities, where we've chosen self-preservation over challenging partnerships.

As we begin our work here today, remind us: that Your limitless love overcomes our limitations, that You have a dream for Your globe that surpasses our wildest imaginations, that You can work through the minutia of detailed legislation and the grand vision of this Nation.

So as we begin our work today, we pray that we may do so ready to trust the lead of Your tender and tremendous love.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WENSTRUP led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BUDGET PLAN

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, the American people, regardless of political affiliation, expect elected leaders in Washington to offer a plan to reduce mounting deficits and revive our stagnant economy. House Republicans agree and have offered another responsible plan to balance the budget with responsible reforms.

Meanwhile, the best plan Senate Democrats can come up with continues to spend more money than we take in. They call for a balanced approach, and yet their budget never balances and includes \$1.5 trillion in new taxes. At least Senate Democrats have finally come around to offering a plan, after spending the last 4 years on the sidelines. The President has yet to submit his budget to Congress, already 6 weeks behind his legal deadline.

Budgets offer a picture of how government plans to steward taxpayer money. The Senate budget asks for higher taxes to fund higher spending, to finance ever-growing government.

My constituents are tired of the cavalier and unserious approach that has become all too common in Washington. I'm pleased that the House Republican majority continues to take its responsibilities seriously and produce budgets which balance, getting us back on track to fiscal sanity and a healthy economy.

ADDRESSING OUR UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 807 days since I arrived in Congress to address jobs, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. More than 12 million American families do not have the luxury of waiting on this issue. They are devastated. There are five students in my

district who graduated from Harvard in 2011, and they're still looking for work. Think of the lost talent.

It's time for Congress to understand that unemployment is an urgent national crisis. It results in lost tax revenue, higher government expenditures, and unbearable levels of human suffering.

Mr. Speaker, our real deficit is unemployment. Let's eliminate this true deficit by bringing the President's American Jobs Act to the floor for a vote. It deserves a vote.

Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

HONORING MARTIN MUMAW III

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional Hoosier, dedicated public servant, and a good friend of mine, Martin Mumaw III—a man with a strong desire to help others and a man who has been a tremendous asset to the Eighth District of Indiana.

Martin has dedicated over 40 years of service to Indiana, the Eighth District, and Daviess County Republican Parties. He is currently serving his fourth term in elected office as Daviess County treasurer. He also has worked with many civic organizations and within the Republican Party as precinct committeeman, county chairman, and member of the Eighth District Central Committee.

His public service and civic engagement have been a means by which Martin has improved the lives of those around him. His dedication and service led former Indiana Governor Robert Orr to name him "Sagamore of the Wabash" in 1988, an award for distinguished public service.

While his public service has been tremendous, Martin is probably best known for his fellowship, kind heart, and sense of humility. He's never met an enemy and is the first to extend a helping hand.

I'm proud to stand here today to honor Martin's history of service, a history to which we all owe a debt of gratitude. God bless you, Martin Mumaw.

GOP BUDGET

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Two thousand dollars; \$2,000 is what you will lose if the Republican PAUL RYAN budget goes through.

What does \$2,000 mean to you?

For a single mom, it could mean the difference between feeding her family or seeing her kids go hungry. For hard-working Americans, it could mean the car payment, or gas money, or prescription drug money that you need to pay each and every month. But to the GOP, \$2,000 is the amount they are tax-

ing middle-class families in their "new budget," the PAUL RYAN budget.

But not everybody has to pay more. The truth is that in this budget, if you're an oil company or corporation taking jobs overseas or a yacht owner, you have nothing to fear with the GOP budget. Your lifestyle is totally secure.

Once again, working families will pay more so the rich can pay less. For the sake of middle class Americans, we must oppose the Ryan budget.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TOM GRIFFIN

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, next to me is a photo of Doolittle Raider Tom Griffin's memorial service I recently attended in Green Township, Ohio. Tom Griffin was an inspiration to everyone who had the honor to know him. I had the great pleasure to meet with and talk to Tom many times over the years. We shared the podium quite often at Memorial Day services, for example, and at veterans' events all over the community.

Tom was a man who literally lived history. In those darkest early days of World War II, when Tom and 79 other Doolittle Raiders took off from the deck of the USS *Hornet*, they had no idea whether they would survive the day.

The American people back then got a much-needed boost when they learned of the heroics that took place that day over Japan. But Tom cringed at the word "hero." He felt that he was just doing what he'd been trained to do. And Tom Griffin went on to risk his life for his country for years following the Doolittle raid, culminating when he was shot down over Sicily and spent 22 months in a German POW camp.

Tom recently said, "What a life I've lived." May we all strive to live a fraction of the life that Tom Griffin did. May God bless Tom Griffin.

□ 1210

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS REPORT CARD FOR AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Society of Civil Engineers report card is out for the quality of America's infrastructure, and the results are a national disgrace and an embarrassment. America gets a D grade for the quality of its infrastructure.

According to the World Economic Forum, we're 24th in infrastructure quality. In 2001, we were No. 2, and we also had a budgetary surplus.

There are 69,000 structurally-deficient bridges in this Nation. Every second of every day, seven cars drive on a

bridge that is structurally deficient; but the Republican budget plan that will be voted on this week cuts infrastructure spending by 32 percent per capita over the next 10 years.

The United States Chamber of Commerce that represents the so-called job creators estimates that we will lose \$336 billion in economic growth over the next 5 years.

China spends 9 percent of its economy on infrastructure; Europe, 5 percent; the United States less than 3 percent.

Moreover, you just spent \$89 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Afghanistan, and \$69 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq, and you propose to cut infrastructure spending per capita by 32 percent.

This is a national disgrace and embarrassment.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAJOR TOM GRIFFIN

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, in 2008, at 92 years old, Major Tom Griffin stood up at a Veterans Day event in Cincinnati, and he told his story as one of the Doolittle's Raiders that attacked Tokyo after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

Managing to bail out after the attack and making his way to China, Tom returned to the U.S., deployed once again, this time to Europe, and was a POW for almost 2 years. Tom Griffin never said, why me; but, rather, why not me?

Growing up in the Depression, Tom Griffin learned to put service above himself. Over the years, I saw Tom tend to other veterans as they aged, and he was there for their final separation from service on Earth.

Tom Griffin has completed his Earthly mission. However, the positive effects of his work will never perish. But are we worth the sacrifice made by Tom Griffin and so many others?

Will history show that we treasured the gift of freedom that he handed us?

We all need to commit to ensure that Tom Griffin's efforts on behalf of freedom will not have been in vain. May he be able to look down at us and say, well done.

Tom Griffin, you led a good life. You were a good man and the greatest of Americans. Thank you, and God bless you, Tom Griffin.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to recognize the contributions that women have made to our society throughout history. As this month marks both Women's History Month and the American

Red Cross Month, I want to take this opportunity to celebrate the lasting contribution of one woman, the founder of the American Red Cross, Clara Barton.

Clara Barton was a true leader, a woman of poise and purpose. During the Civil War, Ms. Barton found common ground by helping everybody in the wake of disaster. She provided medical supplies to the injured, food assistance to the hungry, compassion for all.

Since its founding in 1881, the Red Cross has been a reliable lifeline for Americans and the citizens of our world. Clara Barton passed away in 1912 at the age of 90, but her legacy lives on. It should serve as a reminder to women and to men that the business of helping others is a business worthwhile.

To the women in my district and throughout the country, thank you for your confidence, thank you for your leadership, thank you for your compassion that has helped us move forward.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MARTY STUMBAUGH

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Marty Stumbaugh from Cabot, Arkansas.

A hero is someone who is admired for their courage, nobility, and service to others. Firefighters have long been admired for these traits, and Marty Stumbaugh was a shining example. His life's work was to serve his community as a firefighter. Marty did his job each day with a sense of responsibility and honor.

In addition to serving his community fighting fires, Marty was a former justice of the peace in Lonoke County and constable in York Township. Marty was president of the Cabot Professional Firefighters Association and a member of Mt. Carmel Baptist Church.

Family was the most important part of Marty's life. Marty loved his wife, Mindy, and their two children, Mason and Macy, more than life. Additionally, Marty had close relationships with his siblings: Netta, Karla, Robbin, Corky, Stubby, and Stewart.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and the entire community of Cabot, Arkansas, in honoring the life and service of Marty Stumbaugh.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on National Agriculture Day, we honor the hardworking efforts of America's farmers, farm workers and processors who provide our family with safe and affordable healthy foods.

As a third-generation San Joaquin Valley farmer, I'm proud to represent

our agricultural way of life that drives our economy. More than half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables are grown in California. The San Joaquin Valley produces over \$25 billion in gross value per year, which creates jobs and helps feed our Nation.

Each American farmer needs over 144 people, and they're doing it environmentally safer than ever before. It's more important than ever to remind people that our agricultural economy still touches every part of our lives.

Take a moment today to think about the hand that picked the tomato, or the dairyman, and thank them for that glass of milk. These are among the hardest working Americans that I know.

Let me, again, thank the farmers, the farm workers, and the food processors on National Agriculture Day for your hard work in putting the food that we eat on America's dinner tables.

SERIOUS BUDGETARY ISSUES FACING OUR NATION

(Mr. FLEISCHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the serious budgetary issues facing our Nation. It seems many in this town have forgotten what a budget is, so I thought I'd provide a quick reminder.

Webster's Dictionary defines "budget" most simply as a plan for the coordination of resources and expenditures—a plan for the coordination of resources and expenditures. It's fairly straightforward, and something the American people understand. Frankly, it's something House Republicans understand.

Mr. Speaker, every year since I've been a Member of this body, we have passed a responsible budget. Once again this year, the House Republican budget reduces government spending and gets our debt crisis under control. This, in turn, helps secure the future for our children and grandchildren and creates more jobs and opportunities today.

Senate Democrats finally came to the table and introduced a budget. Unfortunately, it never balances, despite the fact that it raises taxes by \$1.5 trillion.

We're still waiting on a budget from the President, though I suspect we'll see a March Madness bracket from him before we see a budget.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve a real budget, and I plan to continue fighting to ensure they receive one.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS NOT A PATH TO PROSPERITY

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, what's the message?

The message is that Congressman RYAN's budget is not a path to prosperity for our country.

Why? Because we lose with jobs. His 10-year budget destroys 2 million American jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute.

We lose with families and children, because families and children who have income below \$200,000 would have to face a tax increase averaging more than \$3,000 a year.

We lose with seniors. According to the AARP, as they stated, the GOP budget will shift costs to seniors and end the Medicare guarantee. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health care coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work definitely is not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, the American path to prosperity is not for citizens to lose, as we do under the Ryan budget, but to move forward, as set forth in the Democratic alternatives.

□ 1220

CALL FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, a "balanced approach" should not be hard-working Americans give and government takes. This year, the Federal Government will collect a record \$2.7 trillion. Federal spending will far surpass this. Continuing to increase revenue while Federal spending grows, with no end in sight, is not a balanced approach. The balanced approach that we should pursue is a budget that balances and a budget that protects the present and builds for the future.

We're presenting a budget that moves to that end and actually balances by slowing the rate of spending increases. This is a concept that the Washington elite will label as extreme. Yet this is a concept that American families call common sense, and something they do every week. American families have watched government grow and their budget shrink. That's not right.

Why is a budget that balances important for the American people? The answer is found in examples that we see now going on in Western Europe. Governments that overspend and, as a result, underperform hurt the people that they're designed to help the most. Our budget will prevent this type of financial crisis from happening in our country. It will keep the promises to our families and seniors and protect the future of the American Dream.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Later today, we're going to begin consideration of the Republican budget, a plan that not only voucherizes Medicare but retains \$40 billion in subsidies to the oil industry and requires approval of the Keystone

XL pipeline. At a time when climate change is affecting more and more people throughout the country, the majority is committed to keeping our economy dependent on fossil fuels and ignoring the serious challenge that it represents. The \$75 billion in damages from Superstorm Sandy, the ongoing drought in much of the West, including my home State of Arizona, don't seem to be enough evidence that it's time for serious action.

Climate change is global. A United Nations report indicates that because of climate change, 3.1 billion people will be in extreme poverty by 2050. If we want to make a sizable dent in the human contributions to climate change, we have to start making those responsible for pollution accountable and pay for it. This is the sort of leadership the American people are looking for from Congress. Climate change is real. It is not a problem that will go away. We cannot ignore it. We have to face it head on and not bury our heads in Canadian tar sands.

A BALANCED BUDGET IS GOOD FOR THE COUNTRY AND ITS PEOPLE

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as I visited 100 businesses in 100 days last summer, the families who operate and work in those businesses were frustrated with Washington's inability to live within its means. The Federal Government's overspending is hurting their ability to grow. Why? Because small business owners know that there's no such thing as a free lunch. They know that the Federal Government's overspending will come back to us in the form of higher taxes and unfunded entitlements and a weaker economy.

House Republican plans reduce government spending and enact much-needed reforms. Perhaps most importantly, they balance the budget within 10 years.

According to a recent op ed in The Wall Street Journal:

The spending restraint and balanced-budget parts of the House Budget Committee plan would boost the economy immediately.

It is time Washington starts being part of the solution. A balanced budget is good for the country and good for its people.

IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS AT HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HORSFORD. I come to the floor with a heavy heart today. I am deeply saddened by the loss of life as the result of an explosion during a live-fire training exercise at Hawthorne Army Depot last night, which is located in

the northwest part of Nevada's Fourth Congressional District.

I had the honor and privilege of visiting the depot in January and meeting with the fine men and women who work there. The families of those affected are in my thoughts and prayers, and I hope for the recovery of those who are in critical condition and who are receiving medical care as I speak. The losses we have learned about this morning are painful. We have lost seven marines. Others are wounded. My office is in contact with the Governor of Nevada, local officials, and military command to receive updates on the situation.

My thoughts and prayers are with the community of Hawthorne. I will be leaving as soon as possible to return to Nevada to be with our grieving community and servicemembers. I ask for this body's prayers and thoughts for our men and women in service.

OBAMACARE AND JOBS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Health Subcommittee investigated how the new health care law, ObamaCare, is impacting job growth and worker opportunities across the country. The results are not good. The recovery continues to be well below what we need to keep up with workers entering the marketplace. Youth unemployment remains very high, and ObamaCare is showering employers with new red tape.

In our hearing, restaurant group owner Tom Boucher from New Hampshire testified about his struggles. So far, he has spent more than 100 hours with human resources staff trying to prepare for the law. The anticipated economic burden has delayed his plans to open a new restaurant. These are good jobs that could have been created.

ObamaCare is perversely discouraging companies from hiring full-time workers. Many job seekers find that they can only find part-time work right now. We need a dynamic economy creating good private sector jobs. Instead, ObamaCare is forcing employers to spend more time worrying about taxes and accounting and hiring part-time employees. That's not the reform our ailing economy needs.

FUNDING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. People sometimes ask why we can't find common ground. There's an area we should be able to find common ground on—and we don't—and that's funding for the National Institutes of Health, which is going to be cut in the sequester by close to a billion dollars. There was an amendment in the Senate that tried to

put funding back in the continuing resolution for NIH, and it failed on a party-line vote, with 54 Democrats and Independents voting "yes" and 46 Republicans voting "no."

Republicans say the reason they want to cut spending and voted the sequestration in is we're putting a debt on the next generation. Let me submit, Mr. Speaker, that the research that's done at the National Institutes of Health to find cures for cancer, heart disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's, AIDS, and post-polio cures and treatments will affect the next generation more than this generation.

We talk about the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense should be the National Institutes of Health, because the enemy is disease, and we need to conquer it and keep our loved ones alive and keep ourselves alive and have better cures.

We talk about infrastructure—and I support that—but the most important infrastructure is the infrastructure of the human body. And that's what the National Institutes of Health works on. We should work together and fund the National Institutes of Health for all of our constituents.

COMMENDING MISS TEEN MONTANA, ABBI HELLAND

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Abbi Helland, a remarkable young woman from Glasgow, Montana, who was recently named Miss Teen Montana International. Abbi is the daughter of Pete and Allison Helland and the granddaughter of Montana's former Congressman, Ron Marlenee, and his wife Cindy.

Abbi is passionate about reading and making sure that Montanans of all ages have access to books. She'll be working with our State's schools, libraries, and book stores to promote reading education and to support the "I Love to Read Week" in Montana communities. She also will work to install programs to send books overseas and to expand access to books for Montana's seniors.

Abbi is a true example of the spirit and drive that we value in my home State of Montana. She'll represent our State well as our ambassador to the Miss Teen International competition in Chicago this July.

Congratulations, Abbi. We're proud of you.

VOTE AGAINST THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, every budget should be viewed through the lens of the American people. The hard-working Floridians I represent want to

know: Does the Ryan budget put Americans back to work or back on unemployment? The moms and dads I represent want to know: Does the Ryan budget invest in our children or does it ignore our outdated public schools? The small business owners I represent want to know: Does the Republican budget fix our rigged Tax Code or does it protect special interest loopholes? The retirees I represent want to know: Does this budget protect Medicare or does it abandon seniors in the face of skyrocketing health care costs?

The answer is: no. No, the Ryan budget will not put people back to work. No, it doesn't invest in our schools. No, it does not end special interest giveaways. No, it does not protect Medicare.

The Ryan Republican budget does not stand by our communities, and it doesn't invest in our future. That's why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Republican budget.

□ 1230

A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we teach the importance of a balanced budget to our schoolchildren, such as those we had today, but apparently this basic financial principle is not good enough for our President, who says he won't even chase a balanced budget for the sake of balance.

Mr. Speaker, to help the President find a better reason, I would suggest we examine the economic damage caused by runaway public debt. In 2011, Greece, Italy, and Portugal each amassed public debt greater than 90 percent of their economic output. For Greece, the debt was a stunning 165 percent of their gross domestic product. All three countries are now undergoing wrenching austerity and suffering through prolonged recessions and unemployment.

What would this scenario look like for hardworking American families? The burden of unsustainable public debt and increased taxes would lead to higher interest rates on mortgages, car loans, and other credit. Ignoring this problem would bring on higher inflation, reducing the purchasing power of American families and inflicting the most pain on the poor and middle class.

Mr. Speaker, we must support our families. We must support a balanced budget.

RYAN BUDGET ATTACK ON NEVADA SOLAR PROJECT

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget

that's being debated this week and, in particular, to the unfair and inaccurate attack on a clean energy company that's located in my home State of Nevada. The Republican proposal refers to the Solar Reserve project as "an ill-fated venture."

Had he done his homework, Budget Committee Chairman RYAN would have discovered that this cutting-edge solar project is not ill-fated but, instead, has a long-term contract with our State's largest utility. It has created 450 good-paying jobs for Nevadans and is running on schedule and under budget.

The assertions being made in the Republican budget undermine the success of renewable energy programs, the jobs they create, and the investment they represent in our Nation's future energy needs.

In Las Vegas and across the country, Americans have made it clear that our budget should be a path forward for a strong middle class and a serious investment in the next generation of Americans.

Let's reject these mathematical gimmicks and unsubstantiated attacks and get to work on a real budget.

TRUST ACT

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share something that has been at my heart and will, in the coming days, be at the heart of my first bill introduced in the House. When Members of Congress break the law, they break trust: they break trust with their colleagues, hurting our ability to work together; they break trust with the American people who sent them here; and they break trust with the Constitution they swore to uphold.

I will be introducing the Trust Act. This bill is simple. It does not distinguish between types of offenses or the possible reasons behind them. It makes clear that a Member of Congress convicted of any felony will forfeit the taxpayer-funded portion of their pension.

If our servicemen and -women who lay their life on the line for our Nation lose their pension with a dishonorable discharge, should not Members of Congress be held to the same standard?

These days with public opinion of Congress at record lows and public debt at record highs, the Trust Act is a place to start in restoring the faith of the American people to their government. I am pleased to present this opportunity to my colleagues to restore trust to taxpayers, and I ask them to join me in this effort.

WASTE IN IRAQ

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and sacrifice

of the nearly 5,000 coalition troops, including 28 of my brothers and sisters from Hawaii, soldiers like First Lieutenant Nainoa Hoe of Kailua or Sergeant Deyson Cariaga from Honolulu, whom I had the honor of serving with, who paid the ultimate price during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Today marks the 10th anniversary of the American invasion of Iraq. And while this war has largely faded from the headlines, we must take every opportunity to learn from our experiences. There are many lessons we should learn, one of the most egregious being the serious waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars, waste that was apparent to those of us on the ground as well as to outside experts. An alarming report this month by the special inspector general for Iraqi reconstruction also determined at least \$8 billion of our reconstruction funds have been wasted.

In Congress today, we have an opportunity to learn from that lesson. We have to pursue commonsense ways to balance our budget without hurting our middle class families, endangering our national security, or shortchanging our veterans. We must focus on our mission to serve the people who sent us here and honor our servicemembers and their families who have made immeasurable sacrifices in the service of our country.

BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I remember when \$1.4 trillion was a lot of money. 1.4 trillion dollars is the amount of money the Federal budget increases under the House Republican budget proposal—an average of \$140 billion a year, 40 percent over the decade. But listening to my House Democratic colleagues, you would believe our budget cuts spending to the bone. You would believe that our Federal Government can't survive on a penny less than a \$2.1 trillion increase.

Admittedly, that \$700 billion is a lot of money. It's 50 percent more than requested under the House Republican budget proposal. But it is important to remember that every penny of that \$700 billion is borrowed from the future of the young people growing up in this great country today.

Mr. Speaker, families all across America balance their budget. The Federal Government should balance its budget, too.

FEDERAL BUDGET

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, around the country this time of year, it is known as March Madness as the NCAA

basketball tournament is about to begin. But it is March madness in Washington as well, as the debate starts today over what kind of country we are going to leave to our children and grandchildren.

Later this afternoon, the House begins this conversation in earnest with a debate over the Federal budget. For the third year in a row, House Republicans will offer a budget that will balance, and this time we are putting forward a plan that will do so in 10 years. We do this by making careful cuts in spending and without raising your taxes.

Unfortunately, the President hasn't submitted his budget yet; although he was required by law to do so on February 4. And the proposed Senate budget raises taxes by \$1.5 trillion without ever balancing.

Mr. Speaker, the pathway to getting our country back on track begins today. Let's remember America's children and grandchildren as we engage in this important debate.

FORT HOOD

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, 3½ years ago, our Nation was viciously attacked when an Islamic extremist opened fire on our troops at Fort Hood. We lost 14 innocent Americans that day, 12 military servicemembers, one civilian, and an unborn child.

Since the attack, the Fort Hood community has seen and felt an outpouring of support from across the State of Texas and the Nation, but not from the Federal Government. Currently, the troops killed and wounded in this horrible attack are denied the treatment, benefits, and honors granted to soldiers who are attacked overseas in a declared combat zone. The Pentagon deems this attack "workplace violence" rather than "combat violence."

This is shameful, and Americans should be outraged by the administration's refusal to acknowledge this wrong. Our troops were attacked on U.S. soil in a blatant terrorist attack, and we owe it to these patriots and all who wear the uniform to provide for them. They willingly and admirably put their lives on the line every day to protect our freedom.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 705, the Fort Hood Victims and Families Benefits Protection Act, and start providing the needed assistance for the victims and families of this terrible tragedy. Our troops deserve better.

May God bless all who serve.

□ 1240

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 25, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 115, PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 122 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 122

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 22, 2013, through April 8, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; (b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment; and

(c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the ranking member from New York, pending which time I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, that was a mouthful as the Clerk was reading through this resolution, and it was an exciting mouthful. I'm not sure that folks actually were able to get from just the prose the excitement that is in this rule today.

What this rule provides for is two very important things. I'm going to take them in order of my personal passion, but they're both equally important. Number one, this rule provides that every single Member of this House—not just Republicans, not just Democrats, not just folks who are favored, not any particular category—but every single Member of this House who represents a constituency back home had an opportunity to submit their own budget for the United States of America.

So often, the problem in this town is not enough good ideas, Mr. Speaker.

We don't have that problem today because every Member of the House that chose to submit a budget is going to have their budget considered and debated on the floor of this House if we pass this rule today.

Now, that is only five budgets, Mr. Speaker, five plus the Budget Committee's mark, because it's not easy to put together a budget. A lot of folks talk a good game about what they would do if they were king for a day; but when you try to craft your own budget, you've got to put, literally, money where your mouth and ideas are.

In this rule, we make in order a Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget, a Progressive Caucus substitute budget, and a substitute budget by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). We make in order a budget introduced by Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina that tries to capture the essence of what the Senate is working on right now, and we make in order a budget produced by the Republican Study Committee. All of those exist as an alternative to the budget that was produced by the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of sitting on the Budget Committee. What you see here in my hand is the Budget Committee report. We produced this on March 15. It's bound and it's published. They did a very nice job. It's been proofread, and the minority has had a chance to add their views. That was March 15 that we produced this budget.

But as we sit here today with March quickly leaving us, what we do not have yet is a budget from the United States President. I only point that out, Mr. Speaker, to say I understand that it's hard to produce a budget. I know because I produced one in this cycle. I had the great pleasure of working with a team that produced the Republican Study Committee budget and produced the House budget. So in a time period where the President has failed to follow the legally required mandate of introducing a budget by the first week of February, I've had the great pleasure of producing two budgets.

My friends on the Progressive Caucus have produced a budget. My friends on the Congressional Black Caucus have produced a budget. My friend, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, has produced a budget. And I think it is fair when we ask in this debate why we have been denied a chance to look at the President's budget. We didn't see it in February. We didn't see it in March. Word has it now we might see it in April.

It's hard work to produce a budget, but it's important work. In fact, it's legally required work. I take great pride not just that the House will meet its statutory deadline, but that we're meeting it in this very open and honest forum as this rule proposes.

But the second thing this rule does, Mr. Speaker, is it provides for consideration of the committee funding resolu-

tion. This Congress doesn't have a penny to spend except for pennies that we take from the American taxpayer. That's the only place any revenue comes into this United States Government. Part of that revenue goes to fund this very institution.

Thrift begins at home, Mr. Speaker. Before you and I arrived in this body, Mr. Speaker, the committee process here in this House was authorized to spend \$300 million a year. Now, the committees do amazing work. It's important work to produce reports like this Budget Committee report, and they do the oversight on the executive branch. I don't for a minute suggest that the work that the committee structure does isn't critical to the functioning of our Republic. But every single account in the United States Government has to be looked at, examined, critiqued, and reformed if we are to get our fiscal books back in order.

The very first committee funding resolution you and I had a chance to vote on, Mr. Speaker, we reduced that committee funding from \$300 million back in the 111th Congress down to around \$260 in the 112th.

□ 1250

Here we come down again to \$240 million in this resolution. In the 26 now short months that you and I have served in Congress, Mr. Speaker, this body has examined its own books and reduced its spending by 20 percent on committees. That is not an easy task. That's not a task that came lightly. That's a task that has taken tremendous effort by both the majority and the minority.

But my question is, Mr. Speaker, if we can do it, as the American people expect us to do, what could the executive branch do? If we in the people's House can take 20 percent out because our constituents have demanded that we view every single dollar with an eye toward thrift, what could the executive branch do if only they would partner with us as we begin the leadership right here in this body?

None of the easy decisions are left, Mr. Speaker. The only decisions left to be decided in this budget, to be decided in this rule, are the hard decisions. We have provided in this rule the opportunity to consider every alternative that Members have proposed to decide these solutions, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Through numerous budget resolutions and campaign pledges and appearances on Sunday talk shows, the majority has made clear that their vision for America is a vision that says the Nation can no longer care for our seniors, that we must halt vital scientific research and that we should let our bridges and schools crumble because we can't afford to invest in the future.

In short, I believe that it is an extreme and cynical version for America and one that I strongly reject.

For more than a decade, the needs of our country were neglected while the majority led two unfunded wars and gave unaffordable tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, and we now have the cost for the last war in Iraq of \$3 trillion borrowed. In all the discussions on the deficit and what had shape we are in, nobody ever talks about that war and how that has kept us from rebuilding the infrastructure in the United States that cries out for it.

These two decisions unraveled the balanced budget achieved by President Clinton and exploded our Nation's debt. Now after a decade of reckless financial management, the majority is proposing another budget that is as unserious as it is extreme.

Take, for example, the field of scientific research. More than 50 percent of our economic growth since World War II can be attributed to the development and adoption of new technologies, yet the budget proposes drastic cuts to research at the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, among others.

As any scientist will tell you—and I am one—you cannot turn research on and off like a faucet. Across the Federal Government, researchers are on the brink of discoveries that could cure diseases or open entire new fields of commerce. But under the majority's budget, that valuable research will be ended and these important discoveries will probably not be made in the United States.

The majority wants to impose such cuts on top of cuts contained in the sequester, even though the effects of the sequester are just beginning to be felt. For example, in the coming weeks, airport control towers will begin to close, affecting flight schedules and stranding travelers. Many of these towers are located in the rural parts of our country where there are no other alternatives for long-distance travel.

In addition, border patrol agents will be furloughed, which not only affects security but the success of our economy. According to the Congressional Research Service, more than \$1.3 billion a day in trade crosses the U.S.-Canada border. This trade is dependent upon the effective operation of our border security agents. The effects of the sequester are already impacting trade by causing backups at the border and leaving goods and supplies stranded en route to their destination.

Furthermore, it is often forgotten that 5 years after I-35 collapsed above the Mississippi River, we have still failed to repair our crumbling infrastructure.

Earlier today, the American Society of Civil Engineers released a 2013 report card for America's infrastructure. They found that one in eight bridges in my home State of New York is structurally deficient and one in nine

bridges across the United States is the same. A very prominent engineer stated just this past week that there are bridges in major cities in areas of the United States which he would not cross for fear of falling into the water. At the same time, more and more engineers and transportation experts are warning that our bridges will soon be too unsafe to cross unless we act.

These bridges aren't alone. Everything from schools to airports to train stations and highways are literally crumbling before our eyes.

Water systems in many of the major cities in parts of the United States are almost a century old and almost unusable.

Think, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, think of the jobs that would be created, as badly as we need them to put people back to work, if we could not decide to starve again our country's needs and instead start to rebuild the needs and put people back to work.

I think it's inexcusable that instead of responding to the crisis that we have, the majority spent the last 2 years lurching from crisis to crisis and repeatedly introducing legislation such as today's budget legislation that guts investment in the Nation's infrastructure instead of putting us back to work rebuilding the country.

A telling illustration of the failed approach is that they have included the repeal of the Affordable Care Act as the central tenet of their budget proposal. During the 112th Congress, the majority held more than 30 votes in the last 2 years just to repeal the Affordable Care Act, eating up valuable time and costing taxpayers millions of dollars in the process. Despite this expensive folly, the majority wants to do it again. In order to balance the budget, the majority believes we should repeal the lifesaving law and once again legalize health insurance discrimination based upon preexisting conditions, force young adults off their parents' health insurance and open the doughnut hole for our Nation's seniors.

Mr. Speaker, before we were able to pass the health care bill, eight States and the District of Columbia in the United States considered domestic violence to be a preexisting condition and insurance companies were not required to cover victims. Are we going to go back to that if this repeal is achieved?

The majority also wants to cut financial assistance to students in need. The budget cuts Pell Grant assistance by \$83 billion over the next 10 years and allows the interest rates on need-based student loans to double. In a time when we are falling so far behind all other industrial countries in the number of persons who go to college, the United States that used to be first now is about 12th.

By all objective measures, drastic and extreme cuts such as these can be seen as unnecessary cruelty not needed to balance the budget. Indeed, just this past weekend both Speaker BOEHNER and Budget Committee Chairman PAUL

RYAN said on Sunday television shows that this Nation does not face a debt crisis. When asked about it yesterday, Chairman RYAN indicated that, yes, he had said that.

So despite saying that to everybody, scaring America half to death, keeping businesses from being able to plan the future, they continue to promote a dystopian vision of the future in order to convince Americans that we have to adopt their extreme policies today. It is under this guise that the majority proposes their most extreme transformation of America's social safety net in today's budget.

Once again this year, the majority proposes to end Medicare as we know it and turn the promise of guaranteed health care into a voucher program. Unlike Medicare, the majority voucher program would not guarantee seniors access to the health care they need. I think we thoroughly discussed that last year when it failed and certainly during the last election when it failed. This would drive senior citizens into the market with a defined income that they could use to buy their own insurance if they were physically or mentally able to do so.

This is the same failed proposal, and it has been opposed by Americans, as I said, at the ballot box. But we continue today to defy the wishes of the American people with a quest to end Medicare as we know it, and it should be a telling reminder of where priorities lie.

These extreme cuts stand in sharp contrast to the tax reform contained within their budget. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, in order to enact the majority's tax reform and to not increase the deficit, middle class families would have to pay \$3,000 more a year and the wealthiest Americans receive a \$245,000 tax break.

□ 1300

Once again, the majority has shown they would rather take away vital programs from our Nation's most vulnerable than raise a single dollar in taxes on America's wealthiest citizens.

Mr. Speaker, such a budget is neither original nor serious, nor is it acceptable to the American people. We've been down this road before, and it is discouraging and dangerous that the majority insists that we go down it yet once again. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the majority's budget proposal and today's rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to refer the gentleman to the House Budget Committee report.

If she were to read just the first few pages, she would see that spending increases under this budget by \$500 billion in the next 5 years and by \$1.5 trillion over the next 10. I promised myself I would count how many times we heard the words "extreme cuts" applied to what is a half-trillion dollars in new and additional spending, but I confess I've lost track already today.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Rules Committee, a man who crafted this rule that has allowed all ideas on the budget to be considered today. He would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, who sits on the Rules Committee and who also sits on the Budget Committee and is doing an awesome job on behalf of this body and the people of Georgia.

Today, the American people have a chance, really, to see firsthand the rolling out of what we call the Ryan budget. PAUL RYAN, who is the chairman of our Budget Committee, once again leads, I believe, the intellectual thought process on talking about the future that we should have in this country. Certainly, the budget is that primer—that guiding post, that opportunity for us to lay out a philosophy about what Republicans stand for. Today, the American people are having a chance to hear from our colleagues, the Democrats.

Of course, as you listen to our colleagues—our friends, the Democrats—talk, everything about a budget, if you're a Republican, is about harming the middle class, is about ruining the country, is about our heading in the wrong direction. That is because they've taken the simple approach. They will try and fund everything; they will try and fund hospitals; they will fund airports; they will fund schools. They will do all of these amazing things, but the facts of the case are that that process and that future do not work.

Yesterday, PAUL RYAN, before the Rules Committee, very carefully argued the point that really is embodied on this slide, which talks about a responsible way forward for this country, because, you see, we have the authority and the responsibility to make sure that what we do sustains our future: that it's something that creates not only more jobs but opportunities for the future of not just ourselves but of our children and our grandchildren.

For 4 years, this House was led by Democrats, and you can see the laws that they passed and the amazing amount of spending that it would place upon our country. We don't even show in here individually where Social Security is as that will go bankrupt—Medicare, bankrupt; Medicaid, insolvent; our inability to be able to pay for our future by creating jobs today.

The free enterprise system is exactly what Republicans support and believe in because that is the American Dream—not government spending and government jobs but, rather, a vibrant free enterprise system whereby there are employers who want to hire people to become employees, to have careers, to then make this country better and stronger. The way you do that is by lowering government spending, by having a public-private partnership, not by having the Federal Government be responsible for everything from a one-

size-fits-all health care industry to the government control of every part of our lives.

So, yesterday, PAUL RYAN—very effectively, I believe—came before the House Rules Committee and talked about a vision forward. What's very interesting is that everybody else talked about let's just stick it to the rich. Let's raise taxes trillions of dollars. Let's go and stick it to special interests, like people who provide gasoline at the pump, and raise taxes on oil companies. Well, ladies and gentlemen, every time you raise taxes, you raise prices, and every time you raise prices, the consumer has to pay more for it. These are the ideas that make America less able to be prepared for its future and that cost more money.

That's why, when you look at this slide, you see where the laws already enacted by the Democrats are leading America to where we will be functionally bankrupt. We are following the European model—exactly what they have done over there for a number of years—and now we are seeing firsthand Iceland, Greece and, just yesterday, Cyprus. This is the pathway down which our friends, the Democrats, if they get their say, will lead us.

Republicans, through PAUL RYAN, spoke about we want to make sure that Medicare, that Social Security, that the free enterprise system are alive and well by making these plans and the process therein ready for the employers and the workers of tomorrow. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about reforms that will ensure the things that the American people want and need—and, yes, even at the National Institutes of Health so that they will be prepared for our future.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we're talking about today. I can't wait until PAUL RYAN and the Republicans engage Democrats on the floor with facts and figures. This is a primer to what we'll see.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee on the budget, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her continued tremendous leadership on the Rules Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule; and I think the previous speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, really laid out why I'm totally opposed to this rule and the bill.

As a member of the Budget Committee, let me just say that I've had a chance to study this GOP budget, which is full of choices that would undermine our Nation's future for the continued benefit of special interests, the wealthy and, yes, big oil companies—oil subsidies. It creates more income inequality, and it shreds the safety net. It is in keeping with the overall effort we've seen over and over again to dismantle government, increase inequality and leave the most vulnerable people on their own.

We should reject this very warped vision of America, and we should call this budget for what it is. Republicans call it a Path to Prosperity, but it really is a path to poverty for the middle class, for working families, for children, and for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the majority did not support the amendment that I offered in the Budget Committee that would set a goal of cutting poverty in half in 10 years, which listed and reaffirmed those government-supported programs, such as the earned income tax credit, which lifts people out of poverty even though we tried to come to some agreement on language; but, quite frankly, if they supported that goal, they would have accepted my amendment, and their budget would have made some radically different choices.

The reality is we hear the rhetoric that claims to support a goal of ending poverty while at the same time making devastating cuts that put more people into poverty. The fact of the matter is you cannot pretend to fight poverty while you make brutal cuts to the very programs that lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

The Republican budget would make devastating cuts that will increase child hunger, cut off millions of seniors from access to health care, and throw struggling families off TANF during the middle of a jobs crisis. Blocking Medicaid, turning Medicare into a voucher program, and gutting food assistance to our children and our seniors will not reduce poverty. It will just make it worse.

When you look at this Republican budget, for example, it takes 66 percent of the budget cuts from programs for people with low or moderate incomes. It would cost 2 million jobs in 2014, and it would slash \$135 billion over 10 years by cutting 8 million to 9 million people from the SNAP program—our nutrition program, our food stamps program—which is one of the most effective anti-poverty programs in the United States.

The American people deserve more. They deserve a budget that creates jobs, a budget that creates opportunity for all, not a budget that creates more poverty. So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and to vote “no” on this budget because it is a pathway to poverty.

□ 1310

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. If I can just ask my colleague from California before she leaves, and I have the great pleasure of serving with her on the Budget Committee, and I would certainly disagree with most of her characterizations about the work product there, and look forward to dispelling those tomorrow, but today with this rule, I heard you encourage our colleagues to reject this rule. This is, of course, a rule that has made every single idea of every single Member who had a budget plan in order. Does that not satisfy the gentlelady's need for a full and open debate on our budget priorities?

Ms. LEE of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'm happy to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. I don't think I mentioned a full and open debate. What I wanted to talk about was the rule that allows for the presentation of this budget and listed all of the support programs that really keep people out of poverty. And also the fact that yes, we tried, as you know, in the committee to put together an amendment that would actually do that on a bipartisan way. But you can't ignore the fact that we need SNAP. We need food assistance for children and women. We need all of those programs.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I would not ignore those at all. I believe we have made priorities of those in this budget. I look forward to debating that tomorrow.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), another one of my colleagues on the Budget Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I have the privilege, as Mr. WOODALL mentioned, of serving with him on the Budget Committee and serving with him on the Rules Committee, and being a fellow member of the Republican Study Committee with him. And I want to thank him for all he's done, quite frankly, to fashion both the Ryan budget and the RSC budget, and to bring us such an excellent rule today.

Writing a budget in the end is always about making choices. And, fortunately, this rule provides this House with multiple choices, a variety of options, and a great deal of time for debate. We'll have an opportunity to debate the budget offered by our friends in the Congressional Black Caucus. We're going to have an opportunity to debate the Progressive Caucus's budget, the Republican Study Committee's budget, and what we think will be the Senate budget—or at least as close to it as we can determine at this time. Obviously our friends on the other side of the aisle will present their substitute budget, and we'll have the underlying budget, the so-called Ryan budget, the Republican budget. So I think those are a lot of choices that this body will have to work through in the next couple of days. I'm proud that this rule allows that degree of choice and facilitates debate.

Personally, I support both the Republican Study Committee budget, and should it fail to achieve majority, the underlying Ryan budget. Both of them make tough choices. First and foremost to me, they both come into balance. Now our Republican Study Committee budget, which my friend Mr. WOODALL had more to do with than any other Member in crafting, comes in a little faster. I actually think that's a good thing. But the Ryan budget also comes into balance within 10 years. That's important not just for the sake of bookkeeping; it's important because

we all know that private sector growth depends on the confidence that taxes aren't going to continually go up, and that the public sector will remain in check.

I think by giving that kind of assurance, both of those budgets facilitate what I know all of us want, and that's the creation of more and better jobs for the American people. After all, if budgets that never balanced and record deficits got job creation, we would be coming off the four best years in modern American history because we've had four \$1 trillion deficits in a row, another that will "only be" \$850 billion this year. That has yielded us less than 2 percent growth a year. We all know if we took the number of Americans that have left the workforce and recalculated our unemployment rate, it wouldn't be 7.8 percent; it would be about 10.5 percent.

So the path that my friends on the other side recommend doesn't work, and the balance in both the RSC budget and the Ryan budget are a much more promising course. And they achieve that balance while not raising taxes. I think that's very important, too. We certainly aren't undertaxed in this country. Now my friends on the other side clearly believe that we are. They are going to offer multiple tax increases in all their budgets. I like a budget that does not require tax increases.

Finally, both these budgets, the Republican Study Committee budget and the Republican budget, come to grips with the reality that we have to reform entitlements. Now we have our preferred way of doing that, but there could be others. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side are largely silent about that important choice.

As my friend, Mr. WOODALL, mentioned in his remarks, the Ryan budget in particular is hardly a radical budget. It's going to increase spending every single year over a 10-year window by about 3.5 percent. The main Democratic alternative is at about 5 percent. Can't we live at 3.5 percent and have a balanced budget in 10 years as opposed to going to 5 with higher taxes and not balance the budget within that 10-year window?

Again, I'm proud of my Democratic colleagues for joining in the debate. I appreciate the fact that they're going to put multiple budgets on the floor. I wish the President's budget was available. I'm going to assume some day it will be. It should've been here months ago, quite frankly. But sooner or later he will get it into debate.

In my view, all of the Democratic budgets are unacceptable for three very simple reasons: each and every one of them calls for much bigger government, much bigger than we've had historically, and all of them call for higher taxes. And frankly, most of them never, ever, ever balance at all—not in 10 years, not in 20, not in 30. So effectively, our friends are offering more expensive government, bigger govern-

ment, and an eternal and ever-expanding debt. I don't think that's a choice that the American people want to make.

I want to urge support of this generally excellent rule. It provides every Member of this House an opportunity to participate in this important debate. I want to urge passage of the Republican Study Committee budget, and failing that, the underlying Ryan or Republican budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for yielding me this time and rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill that essentially is the Ryan budget.

I want to say to the prior speaker that the way you balance budgets is to put people back to work. This budget, the Ryan budget, will actually cause 750,000 more people to be added to the ranks of the unemployed. When you have 12 million people in our country who've been out of work for a long time or they can't find a decent-paying job, you can't balance budgets with that level of unemployment. This is an anti-growth budget.

I want to focus my remarks, however, mainly on senior citizens and the impact of this budget on seniors. The Ryan budget turns a very cold heart to America's senior citizens. It ends the Medicare guarantee. It throws nearly 50 million Americans receiving earned health care benefits through Medicare to the cruel marketplace and rising health care prices. And it takes away the 10-year guarantee of Medicare's solvency that we passed in the Affordable Care Act. Forty-one million Americans over the age of 65 will be affected, as will 9 million disabled Americans receiving Social Security benefits. That's evidence of a cold heart.

Now the poorest citizens in America are senior women over the age of 80 years. Over half of Medicare's beneficiaries earn annual incomes of less than \$23,000. The Republican Ryan budget doesn't even see them.

The Ryan budget hurts the poorest seniors by putting senior farmer's market nutrition coupons, for example, on the chopping block. To qualify for \$50 to buy fresh fruits and vegetables, a senior has to earn less than \$15,000 a year. Now, under that budget, 863,000 more seniors will be cut off of a fragile lifeline of coupons for better nutrition. Fifty dollars.

The Ryan budget already cut a million meals for fragile seniors across this country. Now, the Ryan budget piles more harm on them.

Meanwhile, Wall Street titans, who took our Nation to the brink, have earned record bonuses, millions and millions and millions of dollars. So it's \$50 for seniors, or multibillions for those who have so much already. That's not even on the scale of justice.

The Ryan budget will cause more illness among our seniors. Seniors will be forced to pay thousands of dollars for medicines they can't afford. It will eliminate free preventive screenings for seniors for cancer and diabetes. So America will yield more illness. The Ryan budget will eliminate free annual checkups for seniors who can't afford to pay for a checkup, and it'll stop free mammograms and prostate screenings for them. It's a cold-hearted budget for seniors.

□ 1320

The Ryan budget will hurt them. It is bad for Medicare. It is bad for seniors. It's bad for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this rule and the underlying budget. Stand up for America's seniors. You know, if you go to any food bank in this country, senior citizens are coming in at an increasing rate of 37 percent. Just look at the lines.

I ask every one of my Republican colleagues this weekend, when you go home, go to your food banks. Look who's in line. Ask yourself what you're going to do to fix the budget for our senior citizens across this country.

Stand up against the coldhearted Republican budget. It's really the forces of darkness at work in here. Open your eyes to what is happening across this country. Vote against this rule and vote against the underlying budget.

Stand up for the seniors of America. In every family in this country, they've earned the right to have a worry-free existence. This budget hurts them.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Ryan budget and vote against this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to speak to accusations of forces of darkness. I've found in my time that light is one of those great illuminators. How convenient in that route.

And I would just refer folks to the budget that's posted online. It's budget.house.gov.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the budget report is there that goes through line item by line item by line item and increases spending, not by the 5 percent that current law would do it, that current law that is sending our children and our grandchildren to bankruptcy, but increases spending by 3.5 percent instead. And within that, the gentlelady from Ohio, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely right. We've got to make priority choices about where it is we want our dollars to go.

But I would say to the gentlelady—and I know her heart is pure as she talks about the investment and where she wants to make it in this country—tell me what it is that you and I are willing to pay for today, and let's make that investment.

You know, I think about Hurricane Sandy, for example, all those families in need that we wanted to help; and, you know, we didn't raise a single penny here to do it. We asked our children and our grandchildren to pay for every nickel.

I don't need encouragement to visit those food banks. I've been there already, and I know exactly what the gentlelady's talking about.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman be kind enough to yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, then you've seen them in the line. You've seen the senior women in the line in all these food banks, a third of an increase, sir.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, indeed I have. I've seen our neighbors there filling those needs as well.

Again, it is so frustrating to me, Mr. Speaker, in this body, we do not argue about who are the poorest and the neediest among us. We know with certainty who those folks are. What we argue about is whether it's your and my obligation to feed and clothe those folks, or whether we should pass that obligation along to our children and our grandchildren.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, it is immoral. It is immoral for us to ask our children and our grandchildren to pay bills for charity that you and I are not willing to do ourselves today.

I'm so pleased that this rule has made every idea available on the floor of the House for a vote today, but we must choose to do it ourselves. The time for passing the bill to our children and grandchildren is long gone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm pleased to yield another minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

I would say to the gentleman, what you said was very, very important, because we do have choices in a budget. And you know, sir, at the food banks around this country, there isn't enough food being provided. They're absolutely at the edge. There isn't enough to go around. That's where the Government of the United States has to come in.

We can't ask our seniors to have any less meals. We can't ask our seniors to take any other nutrition cuts. There simply isn't any slack there.

Now, maybe you live in a community that's more affluent, I'm not sure. I represent three of the lowest income communities, urban areas in this country, and I see what's happening there. And you know, if you look at the amount of subsidy going out to the producers in our country, we could nick that just a little bit, and we could find the funds to help our seniors.

I would invite you to Ohio. I would invite you to see a State that still has 7 percent unemployment and what happens at these food banks. It's vitally important that we not cut help for senior citizens. There isn't any loving

child or grandchild in this country that wants to hurt their grandmother or their mother or father.

I think that your budget is misguided, and I would commend the gentleman, please look at those lines. Restore the funds I'm asking for. And I invite you to Ohio.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds just to say to the gentlelady, my sister and brother-in-law and two beautiful nieces live in Athens, Ohio, one of the poorest regions in southern Ohio. I know exactly what the gentlelady is saying.

We do have to make these choices, and I commend our friends in the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive budget for laying out their guidelines for raising taxes by \$4 and \$6 trillion, respectively, to try to pay for some of those priorities; but even in those budgets, they still never balance.

I'm saying that you and I today, from the great wealth that is in this country today, have a chance to either pay for things that we think are important or borrow money from our children and our grandchildren to pay for things that we think are important. You and I are closer to death than we are to birth. These bills are going to be paid by our children and our grandchildren. And today, for example, the President's budget, we've never seen a budget that projected paying back even a penny over the next 75-year window.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

I would welcome the opportunity to work closer across the aisle than we are here today to address those needs that we all agree on. I would say to the gentlelady, our disagreement is not on whether or not those needs exist; it's whether or not you and I are obligated, morally, spiritually, as a function of our community, to serve those needs or whether we can pass that bill on to others.

I know the gentlelady has a strong passion for doing that. I hope she would join with me so that we can do it together, not ask someone else to do it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman kindly yield just for a couple of seconds here—

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. KAPTUR.—Just to say that the first obligation is to feed the hungry, feed the hungry. And I don't think the gentleman would want to have on his conscience any harm to the senior citizens of this country, so I'd ask you to rereview your budget and fix it.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank both of my colleagues. I thank the gentlelady and the manager of this rule.

I vigorously rise to oppose this rule, the underlying bill, the Republican proposal for a budget. And I really do speak from the heart, because when you go home, it is often the best time of the service to your Nation because you get to see hardworking Americans, no matter what region you live in. And so I'm very proud to associate myself and support the Van Hollen Democratic budget substitute, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The singular theme that rides through all of these budgets, which is the very question that is raised, whether or not it's a teenager coming out looking for a summer job; whether or not it's a college student with their bright, new diploma holding it up, looking for America's great opportunity; or whether it's someone who has worked for a period of time, well-qualified, but just can't find the job to get back into the market. I know there are those who are listening, my colleagues, who have constituents like that. Every single budget, including the Van Hollen budget, the Democratic budget, helps to create jobs, gets rid of the sequester and, in actuality, brings back the 775,000 or 750,000 jobs lost by the Ryan budget, plus more.

The Congressional Black Caucus focuses on maintenance for public transit and highway and airports, creating jobs. The Congressional Progressive Caucus focuses on making work pay and emergency unemployment compensation.

But here's the story that I think is under the underlying Ryan budget—good friend of ours, of course, we work together—and the underlying premise.

I am tired of raising up the generational fight. Just because the Greatest Generation fought in World War II, are we to say to our children and grandchildren, "You know what, we don't want to burden you when the military calls you, when your Nation needs you; we don't want to burden you?"

□ 1330

There's no way to protect what our grandchildren and children will have with this budget, other than the fact that the Democratic budget invests in people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When you have a preschool program, when you have programs that transition women out of their homes after raising their children and into jobs, when you have a program that allows young people with a college degree to get a job, when you have programs that invest in infrastructure and build highways and bridges that America is begging for—like the Hoover Dam—that our grandchildren and children will receive in

America, that we invested in, they'll receive a gift. And they'll be able to work with their hands and their minds, and they will have the ability to pay down any debts and they'll close any deficit. And they'll be grateful to do it, because America will be the greatest Nation that it can.

Don't constantly pound us with our grandchildren and our children. Right now, today, America can afford to pay for what we are doing in the Van Hollen Democratic budget because we are creating jobs, we're building infrastructure, we're making America greater—the very America that people around the world admire.

So I want to vote for a growth budget. I want to vote for one that reduces unemployment under 5 percent. I want to vote for one that lifts America so that our children and grandchildren will have the benefit of all that we've done for them, and they'll have the benefit of paying for what America promises.

Vote for America's promise. Vote against the Ryan budget.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to a new member of the Rules Committee, but a senior member and leader of this House, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and certainly thank him for leading this rule on the floor this afternoon.

This is an important vote we're going to have today. The rule that will bring various budgets to the floor is a very fair product. As the gentleman knows, as we sat through the hours of debate in the Rules Committee last night, this is not just the product of the Budget Committee that is coming to the floor. It's not just Chairman RYAN's budget that is coming to the floor. But these are budgets that have been proposed by a number of different groups within the Congress—the Congressional Black Caucus, the Progressive Caucus, the Democratic substitute, the Senate budget is going to be offered as a substitute, where people can vote, and the Republican Study Committee. At the end of all that time, if none of the budgets receive the majority vote in the House of Representatives, then and only then will the product of the Budget Committee be voted on by the entire House. My expectation is that that is the budget that will pass.

But our argument here today is not over what is contained within the Budget Committee's product anymore than it is what's contained within the Progressive's budget product. After all, what we're voting on today is the rule that will allow us the ability to debate these differences in philosophy on the floor of this House tomorrow, on C-SPAN, transparent for all the country to see; and they'll be able to see the big philosophical differences that exist.

We heard in the Rules Committee last night that it's unfair to bring the Senate budget to the floor of the House

for a vote because the Senate budget has not been voted on on the floor of the Senate and that obstructionist Republicans in the Senate will keep the Senate from voting; but, actually, that's not true. The Senate, under its own rules, can bring the budget to the floor of the Senate and pass it with a simple majority. That's a 50-plus-1 majority. There's not enough Republicans in the Senate to block that or any other budget.

So the discussion that it's unfair to bring the Senate budget to the floor of the House to vote on before the Senate has a chance to vote, the Senate could have voted on their budget at any time. The Senate could have voted last year for a budget. The Senate could have voted the year before for a budget. They chose not to because they did not want to put it out for the American people to see what their core philosophical belief is, which is that you have to raise taxes by a trillion dollars on the American people in order to pass a budget.

We hear it time and time again that the greatest antipoverty program in this country is a job. The growth that is provided for in the budget that will be debated upon—and I hope pass tomorrow—we can't discount the importance of that growth.

I just came from a hearing in the Energy Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce. We were fortunate to hear from one of the members of the Railroad Commission in Texas. The Railroad Commission doesn't have anything to do with trains anymore. It has all to do with energy. And Commissioner Smitherman from Texas was at the committee hearing, and I asked him a question. I said, In the Ryan budget that we will hear about tomorrow, there is an estimate of \$11 billion over the next 10 years that will be paid to the Federal Government because of development of oil and natural gas on Federal lands. I said, I'm from Texas. That number seems a little bit light to me. I would expect the amount of revenue produced on Federal lands from oil and gas production, assuming we don't legislate it out of existence through the Environmental Protection Agency. And he said, In Texas, the 2-year budget figure for oil and gas severance taxes is \$7 billion.

Well, that would be a significantly greater amount than the \$11 billion estimated in the Ryan budget. I asked Mr. RYAN about this last night at the Rules Committee. This is the amount that is allowed under Congressional Budget Office expectations. But, honestly, if we free up the energy that we have available within our own shores, within our own borders, that is a jobs program that would go a long way towards producing that unemployment rate of 5 percent that the gentlelady from Texas just referenced.

I know this because in the district that I represent in north Texas, gas production from a geologic formation known as the Barnett shale has yielded

significant economic benefits and significant employment as a result. In fact, when the Nation entered into a recession in December of 2007, constituents in my district basically read about it in the newspapers because it wasn't until 12, 13, or 14 months later when the price of natural gas came down so low that we actually felt the recession in Texas.

So let's utilize that energy that's at our disposal. Life without energy is cold, brutal, and short. We have the ability to produce energy on our own shores. One of the things where I think we can look to the Ryan budget for leadership is allowing that energy to be produced on Federal lands.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. May I inquire from my colleague if he has further requests.

Mr. WOODALL. I will say to the gentlelady I do not have further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. In closing, Mr. Speaker, my Democrat colleagues and I have spoken at length today about the dangerous shortcomings of the budget proposal of Mr. RYAN. Fortunately, Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, has an alternative proposal that significantly reduces the Nation's deficit while creating jobs and protecting programs like Medicaid and Medicare. And unlike the majority's proposal, Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget repeals the sequester, which is estimated to cost the Nation 750,000 jobs this year.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has repeatedly tried to avert the sequester. He has come to the Rules Committee numerous times with proposals to replace the sequester with responsible budget cuts and has been repeatedly denied the opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the House floor.

By voting for Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget, every Member of this Chamber can vote to do away with the sequester. On behalf of the thousands of Americans who are facing pay cuts, furloughs, and job losses, I urge my colleagues to repeal the sequester today and vote to balance the budget in a responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, while the majority would like you to believe that a looming debt crisis is imminent, it is simply not true. Even this last weekend, both Speaker BOEHNER and Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN said on television there is no immediate budget crisis facing our Nation. Please think of that, my colleagues, as you vote.

In acknowledging this reality, it is important to realize that it is possible to make investments in our economy today, create jobs, repeal the sequester, and still reduce our deficit in a responsible and balanced way.

In closing, I urge my colleagues not to be scared by the rhetoric that sometimes we hear. Instead, I urge my colleagues to support one of the multiple

budget proposals that reduce our deficit responsibly while creating jobs today and protecting the important programs like Medicaid and Medicare for generations to come.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1340

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentlelady for being with me on the floor today.

I'll say that we sometimes have some controversy in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. There's a lot of responsibility that lies in the Rules Committee. With 435 folks here in this Chamber, and we all would like to have our say—and we'd all like to have our say probably more than once—the Rules Committee is tasked with managing that debate.

I'll tell you, I think the rule we passed last night is the best rule we've done all year along. Now, my colleague from New York may think I'm damming it with faint praise. But I would say that having this open debate that we will have tomorrow on budgets is about the best we can do in this institution, Mr. Speaker. To allow every single idea, every single individual from the most junior Member who was just elected 2 months ago to the most senior Member who has been here 40 years, if you have a budget idea, you get to have it heard on the floor of the House. In this case, Mr. Speaker, that's going to be six budgets we're going to look at tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe having an open process is important. We made in order the Progressive Caucus budget. That Progressive Caucus budget raises taxes by \$5.7 trillion—unashamed, unabashed. Tough economy; let's raise taxes by \$5.7 trillion, and let's increase spending even more than we are today. I'm glad that that budget is going to be here on the floor.

The Congressional Black Caucus raises taxes \$4.2 trillion. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute raises taxes \$1.2 trillion.

As you saw from the chart that the chairman of the Rules Committee had on the floor of the House earlier, Mr. Speaker, we don't have a tax problem in this country, we have a spending problem in this country. If we took everything from everybody, we still wouldn't have enough money to pay for all of the promises that previous Congresses and previous Presidents have made. What that translates into is fear.

We can do better for the American people than election after election to scare them with the looming bankruptcy of programs that they depend on. Yet we know the Social Security Disability Insurance program—already out of money, Mr. Speaker. The Medicare program—which my mom and dad depend on—going out of business in 2023. The Social Security retirement program, Mr. Speaker, not enough money to fund future promises. We

have a chance to either ignore those promises or embrace those challenges.

I will tell you we do not have a crisis in this country; we have an opportunity in this country to do the things that we have long known we needed to do.

In 1983, Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats came together, extended the life of the Social Security program and provided certainty and security to another generation of America's seniors. We have an opportunity tomorrow to do the same thing for the Medicare program, or to kick the can down the road and ensure uncertainty, crisis, and fear in yet another generation of Americans who depend upon these programs.

I urge all my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this rule that will allow every single idea to be considered tomorrow. And when you come to the floor tomorrow, choose that budget that makes the tough decisions.

It takes no courage at all to let someone else pay the bills, Mr. Speaker. It takes no courage at all to let the next generation sort out the problems. The courage is coming together today to say, even though the weight is going to fall on our shoulders to solve the problem, we owe it to the next generation. We owe them nothing less.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule. I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1415

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 122; adopting House Resolution 122, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 25, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 115, PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 122) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]
YEAS—223

Alexander	Coffman	Gibbs
Amash	Cole	Gibson
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Gingrey (GA)
Bachus	Conaway	Gohmert
Barletta	Cook	Goodlatte
Barr	Cotton	Gosar
Barton	Cramer	Gowdy
Benishek	Crawford	Granger
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Billirakis	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (UT)	Daines	Griffith (VA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Grimm
Blackburn	Denham	Guthrie
Bonner	Dent	Hall
Boustany	DeSantis	Hanna
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Harris
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Buchanan	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Bucshon	Farenthold	Holding
Burgess	Fincher	Hudson
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Camp	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Fleming	Hultgren
Cantor	Forbes	Hunter
Capito	Foxx	Hurt
Carter	Franks (AZ)	Issa
Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Chabot	Gardner	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Garrett	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Gerlach	Jones

Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer

Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Esty

Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Amodei
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Flores

Fortenberry
Graves (MO)
Harper
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Lynch

Miller, George
Nadler
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)

□ 1444

Mr. VISCLOSKY and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 189, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—224

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham

Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman

Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt	Fortenberry	Lynch
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Miller, George
Collins (GA)	Harper	Nadler
DeLauro	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Engel	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)

□ 1453

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 77 on H. Con. Res. 18, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 78 on H. Con. Res. 19, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 79 on moving the previous question for H. Res. 122, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 80 on H. Res. 122, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 133, answered "present" 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—272

Alexander	Cárdenas	Duckworth
Bachmann	Carney	Duncan (SC)
Bachus	Carter	Duncan (TN)
Barber	Cartwright	Ellison
Barletta	Cassidy	Ellmers
Barrow (GA)	Castro (TX)	Enyart
Barton	Chabot	Esty
Becerra	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Bentivolio	Chu	Fattah
Bera (CA)	Cicilline	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Cleaver	Fleming
Bishop (GA)	Coble	Foster
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Frankel (FL)
Black	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Connolly	Gabbard
Bonamici	Cook	Gallego
Bonner	Cooper	Garamendi
Boustany	Cramer	Garrett
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Gibbs
Bridenstine	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brooks (AL)	Daines	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	Davis (CA)	Granger
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Graves (GA)
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Grayson
Buchanan	Delaney	Grimm
Buchanan	DelBene	Guthrie
Bustos	DeSantis	Gutierrez
Calvert	DesJarlais	Hahn
Camp	Deutch	Hall
Campbell	Diaz-Balart	Hanabusa
Cantor	Dingell	Harris
Capito	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Capps	Doyle	Heck (WA)

Hensarling	Meehan	Schneider
Higgins	Meeks	Schock
Himes	Meng	Schrader
Horsford	Messer	Schwartz
Huffman	Mica	Schweikert
Huizenga (MI)	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Hurt	Miller, Gary	Scott, David
Issa	Moore	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (GA)	Moran	Sessions
Johnson, E. B.	Mullin	Shea-Porter
Johnson, Sam	Mulvaney	Sherman
Kaptur	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Kelly	Napolitano	Shuster
Kennedy	Negrete McLeod	Simpson
Kildee	Neugebauer	Sinema
King (IA)	Noem	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	Nunnelee	Smith (TX)
Kingston	O'Rourke	Smith (WA)
Kline	Olson	Southerland
Kuster	Palazzo	Speier
Labrador	Pascarell	Stewart
LaMalfa	Payne	Stutzman
Lamborn	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Lankford	Perry	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Larson (CT)	Petri	Thornberry
Latta	Pingree (ME)	Tierney
Levin	Pitts	Titus
Loeb	Pocan	Tonko
Loftgren	Polis	Tsongas
Long	Pompeo	Upton
Lowenthal	Posey	Van Hollen
Lowe	Price (NC)	Vela
Lucas	Quigley	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Rangel	Walden
Lujan Grisham	Reichert	Walorski
(NM)	Rice (SC)	Walz
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Wasserman
(NM)	Roby	Schultz
Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Watt
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (KY)	Waxman
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Weber (TX)
Marino	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
Markey	Rokita	Welch
Massie	Roskam	Wenstrup
McCarthy (CA)	Ross	Westmoreland
McCarthy (NY)	Rothfus	Whitfield
McClintock	Roybal-Allard	Williams
McCollum	Royce	Wilson (FL)
McHenry	Ruiz	Wilson (SC)
McKeon	Runyan	Wolf
McKinley	Ruppersberger	Womack
McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Rodgers	Salmon	Yoho
McNerney	Scalise	Young (FL)
Meadows	Schiff	Young (IN)

NAYS—133

Amash	Gardner	Maloney
Andrews	Gibson	Carolyn
Barr	Gingrey (GA)	Matheson
Bass	Gowdy	Matsui
Beatty	Green, Al	McDermott
Benish	Green, Gene	McGovern
Bishop (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Miller (FL)
Brady (PA)	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (FL)
Brown (GA)	Hanna	Neal
Burgess	Hartzler	Nolan
Butterfield	Hastings (FL)	Nugent
Capuano	Heck (NV)	Nunes
Carson (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Holding	Pastor (AZ)
Clarke	Holt	Paulsen
Clay	Honda	Pearce
Clyburn	Hoyer	Peters (MI)
Coffman	Hudson	Peterson
Cohen	Huelskamp	Pittenger
Conyers	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Costa	Israel	Price (GA)
Cotton	Jackson Lee	Radel
Courtney	Jeffries	Rahall
Crawford	Jenkins	Reed
Crowley	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Cummings	Jones	Ribble
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Roe (TN)
DeFazio	Joyce	Rooney
Denham	Keating	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Kilmer	Rush
Duffy	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Edwards	Kinzing (IL)	Sanchez, Linda
Farr	Kirkpatrick	T. Sarbanes
Fincher	Lance	Schakowsky
Fitzpatrick	Latham	Serrano
Flores	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Forbes	Lewis	Sires
Fox	LoBiondo	Slaughter
Fudge	Maffei	Stivers

Stockman	Valadao	Waters
Terry	Vargas	Wittman
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Yoder
Tiberi	Velázquez	Young (AK)
Tipton	Visclosky	
Turner	Walberg	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—25

Aderholt	Grijalva	Nadler
Amodei	Harper	Pelosi
Collins (GA)	Hinojosa	Rigell
DeLauro	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Engel	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Eshoo	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Fortenberry	McCauley	Yarmuth
Gohmert	McIntyre	
Graves (MO)	Miller, George	

□ 1501

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 19, I missed 3 rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on #79, 80, and 81.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE TWENTY EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-22) on the resolution (H. Res. 127) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth Congressional District of Texas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 127 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 127

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth Congressional District of Texas is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 122, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the resolution is considered as read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$10,072,374; Committee on Armed Services, \$13,127,070; Committee on the Budget, \$10,277,648; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$13,905,526; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$19,041,032; Committee on Ethics, \$6,040,918; Committee on Financial Services, \$14,788,964; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$14,776,224; Committee on Homeland Security, \$14,067,176; Committee on House Administration, \$9,201,120; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$8,779,516; Committee on the Judiciary, \$14,154,032; Committee on Natural Resources, \$13,111,658; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$17,880,874; Committee on Rules, \$5,714,816; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$10,565,510; Committee on Small Business, \$5,985,376; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$16,364,614; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$6,097,092; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$16,846,822.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2013, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2014.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,036,187; Committee on Armed Services, \$6,563,535; Committee on the Budget, \$5,138,824; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$6,952,763; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,520,516; Committee on Ethics, \$3,020,459; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,394,482; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,388,112; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,033,588; Committee on House Administration, \$4,600,560; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,389,758; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,077,016; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,555,829; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$8,940,437; Committee on Rules, \$2,857,408; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,282,755; Committee on Small

Business, \$2,992,688; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,182,307; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,048,546; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,423,411.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2014, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2015.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,036,187; Committee on Armed Services, \$6,563,535; Committee on the Budget, \$5,138,824; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$6,952,763; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,520,516; Committee on Ethics, \$3,020,459; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,394,482; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,388,112; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,033,588; Committee on House Administration, \$4,600,560; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,389,758; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,077,016; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,555,829; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$8,940,437; Committee on Rules, \$2,857,408; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,282,755; Committee on Small Business, \$2,992,688; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,182,307; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,048,546; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,423,411.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2014, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) BALANCE.—The balance of the reserve fund under this section shall be equal to the sum of the following:

(1) The amount by which the amount made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" for fiscal year 2013 exceeds the amount that would be made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" by division C of the

Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (H.R. 933, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 6, 2013), as reduced pursuant to the provisions of division D of such Act.

(2) The amount by which the amount made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" for fiscal year 2014 exceeds the amount made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" for fiscal year 2013.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of House Resolution 115, which is providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress and which authorizes committee budgets for the 113th Congress.

Earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration held two very lengthy and very informative days of hearings with our chairmen and with our ranking members from all of the 19 House committees. Each of them testified about their respective budgets, the commitment to uphold the longstanding two-thirds, one-third allocation between majority and minority offices; and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, they talked about doing more with less, which is a topic that we are all very, very familiar with.

This funding process and these discussions significantly impact the legislative process as these committees are where, of course, the legislation that comprise much of our work begins, where our vital oversight functions occur, which is why throughout this process we adhered, Mr. Speaker, to two very important principles. First of all, we said we need to live within our means, and then prioritizing the finite resources that we have provided to us

in the Congress by hardworking American taxpayers.

As we all know, sequestration went into effect on March 1, 2013, and Congress must live with further cuts, just as every other agency of government must live with similar cuts. As a result of the sequester, the total committee authorization level must be reduced by approximately 11 percent, in the 11 percentile range. And that means if we authorize above that amount, then we will have to take the money from somewhere else.

When ensuring that committees have adequate resources, obviously, we have to consider their legislative objectives; we have to consider their anticipated workload and authorize the finite resources available in a way that best suits the needs of the House of Representatives as a whole.

Although the sequestration is not certainly the ideal way to cut spending, cuts are imperative. They must happen. Our government is too big, too involved, and too costly. As those who are charged with the care of taxpayers' dollars, we need to lead by example, and we must control our spending. We must live within our own means.

Now, this may be a far more strict budget than many had hoped or anticipated, but like so many Americans, we are coping with our circumstances, and we are making cuts to our budgets in a way that any American business or American family would have to, as every local unit of government, every State around the country has had to do. Certainly during these very trying economic times, we also have to make value judgments and budget accordingly.

To match the available post-sequestration funding level, the total authorization amount for House committees must be reduced, as I say, by about 11 percent from the 2012 level; and, therefore, with very few exceptions, each committee authorization has been reduced, again, within that 11 percent range or certainly within a percentage point or so of the 11 percent.

Based on the anticipated workload for the 113th Congress, the Budget Committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Select Committee on Intelligence have been given very much smaller reductions, a very slight reduction from the 11 percent. But every committee certainly will be faced with important oversight responsibilities for 2013. However, given that getting our economy moving again and defending this Nation are the foremost priorities that we face, the dire need for tax and entitlement reform to help grow our economy, to create good-paying private sector jobs and the increasing cyberthreats to our digital infrastructure, it was determined by our committee that these three committees certainly are the tip of the spear in doing some of the most important work for the American people.

We must remain, as well, committed to leading by example in cutting gov-

ernment waste, rooting out inefficiencies, and conducting essential and efficient oversight of our vast administrative agencies.

House Resolution 115, Mr. Speaker, we believe fulfills that mission. I would also point out that this House resolution not only reduces committee expenditures, but it also authorizes total committee funding for the 113th Congress at a level which is lower than 2005. I think that bears repeating—a level lower than 2005. By comparison, overall nondefense discretionary spending by the executive branch has actually increased 16.7 percent since 2008—quite a big difference there.

As I said before, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I certainly understand the challenges of stretching committee resources, and I have a very deep appreciation for every committee's ability to absorb these cuts and their commitment to functioning at a high level, even with the reduced resources that they have, and that is due certainly in no small measure to the outstanding leadership that we have with each committee chairman and each ranking member on all of our committees, really, all committed to delivering a very high level of service to the American people.

Some of my colleagues, I know, have voiced their opposition to this measure calling for a freeze in committee spending. They say that freezing spending for committees at 2012 levels is a more balanced approach. But since sequestration, we just don't have the money to cover a freeze. We do not have the money.

So I would simply state that spending beyond our means, in my opinion, is not a balanced approach. In fact, I would say it's a bit irresponsible. As I said before, every American family, every small business, every State and local unit of government must live within their means, and so must the U.S. House of Representatives.

□ 1510

Mr. Speaker, again, this resolution has required us to make some very difficult but very necessary decisions. And I want to personally thank, and certainly all of our committee members thank, each chairman and each ranking member who testified before our committee, and our committee staffs as well, who are often unrecognized for the vital work that they do.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 115, living within our means and prioritizing our finite resources like the rest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 115 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 115 represents the next step in a slow march towards making House committees incapable of conducting the over-

sight with which they are charged and further limiting the power of this equal branch of government.

Mr. Speaker, with these cuts, we are not talking about the loss of new equipment, the next computer, or printer. No. With these cuts, we are talking about gutting our capacity to do the jobs we were sent here to do by the American people. The work product of our committees is only as good as the talented men and women that we are able to employ. And they are very able.

The House is lucky to have such a well-seasoned and skilled group of individuals carrying out the people's business. In fact, this is one of the things we always agree on—the quality of the people that work in these committees. It is at the highest level. But for how long?

If this resolution passes, there will be a 21.3 percent reduction in funding for committees since the 111th Congress. More appalling is the 26 percent cut the Judiciary Committee will sustain during the same time, particularly as they move forward to address comprehensive immigration reform that we all seem to agree on now and the initiatives to reduce gun violence.

As the chairman of the Rules Committee stated last week when he testified before our committee, "We do not have something we can cut or manage on a moving forward basis. We have by and large taken ourselves down to the bare bones." Now we're down to the bare bones. Repeatedly, we heard from committee chairs that the only thing they have left to cut are personnel expenses.

The Veterans' Affairs chairman stated, "We have no choice but to find these savings in our personnel budget."

And the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said:

We want to make certain that those individuals who will make a sacrifice and come up here and work for a reduced wage will stay with us. There is a question of how long, deeply, we can cut.

Of course there is a question, and I think the question is before us.

The chairs and ranking members of the House have been responsible stewards—we have heard that already—and they have been. And they have achieved incredible savings. But this resolution's lack of funding also hurts our ability to find governmentwide cost savings.

In fact, it does just the opposite. The committees conduct oversight over billions and billions of dollars of Federal spending and have found savings within their respective agencies. However, without high quality people that have the institutional knowledge and expertise, they will sacrifice the ability to perform strong, responsible oversight.

The chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee illustrated this best when testifying about the savings his auditors were able to provide the government. He stated:

Cutting back for us is, in fact, an opportunity to lose the very auditors that will

guarantee you multiple savings. We would like to work with the committee to allow us and other committees to find similar savings. But we must ask that you not allow the audit committee to be reduced when, in fact, we can return you more than 1,000 times our budget.

One thousand times. In Mark, it is only 100 times. Fourfold in other parts of the Bible. Here is 1,000 times.

Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have embraced the idea of doing more with less. We have all grappled with the idea of not filling empty positions, denying requests for travel and forgoing necessary technology upgrades in our offices. But there is a point where additional cuts undermine our ability to do our jobs effectively.

Based upon the testimony that we have received during our committee funding hearings, I believe that there is a bipartisan agreement that this funding resolution could represent that breaking point. In the end, the American people will be the ultimate victims.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield as much time as he may consume to an outstanding member of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chair for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 115, but I appreciate, quite honestly, the concerns just raised. And let me try to address some of them, if not all of them.

There are victims in this country, for sure. But the real victimization will occur if this House, if this Congress, if this President does not get ahold of the deficit and debt situation that we are incurring. Right now, we are in the middle of debating different budgets, the priorities that we have as parties, as Americans, et cetera.

On the one hand, we have a budget that balances in 10 years—radical for this town. On the other side, we have budgets that never, ever balance. If we don't get ahold of these deficits so we can finally start attacking the debt, and if we continue to leave to future generations our bills—to me, Mr. Speaker, the most immoral thing I can think of, really, that we can do in civic life is to leave our bills for future generations to pay. There will be the victimization.

Yes, we are going to have a hard time at the committee level, and certainly even with our MRAs that have been cut in the past, to try to do our work. But what I heard in these committee hearings from our chairman and our ranking members each is that they pledge to continue their legislative and oversight activities despite these budget cuts. So there is not going to be any victimization here with this House resolution.

The other thing this House resolution does is finally lets us lead by ex-

ample, Mr. Speaker. How can we have a national family discussion? How can we have a discussion about the morality of leaving our bills for future generations to pay if we are not willing to suck some of it up ourselves? And, yes, we are doing it. Do you know who else is doing it? The military.

I would like to say here on the floor of the House that those excuses should now be taken off the table. We are leading by example in what we have cut through our MRAs already and this House resolution. And guess what? So has the military.

Let's finally get to a discussion and action, more importantly, regarding the real drivers of our debt—the social entitlement programs of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And, yes, many of our constituents will say, Hey, wait a minute. Don't call those social entitlement programs. We paid into those, therefore, we should get out. And that is true. But what is also true is that on average—let's take Medicare, for example, Mr. Speaker—we are paying in about 40 percent, again, on average, of what we are taking out. It is immoral, wrong, to let that 60 percent get paid for by people who don't even yet exist and, therefore, don't have a say in the matter.

House Resolution 115 lets us lead by example so that we can finally get to the rest of the conversation about the drivers of our debt. Guess what else? The interest we owe ourselves as private citizens—and, more increasingly, other countries like China, countries that don't necessarily have our best interest at heart, nor should they have to have our best interest at heart—we are paying more to them in interest because of this debt than we are spending on homeland security, education, and roads combined.

That breeds weakness, that fosters instability, that creates victimization. House Resolution 115 will give us the moral authority and the real authority to continue having this discussion, to lead by example, which is so well needed in this country right now at this time. The fact of the matter is, we shouldn't have to have oversight of the budgets of the executive branch if the executive branch and this President were to lead and recognize the debt that we are in, the deficits that we run, and rein in his own people, rein in his own organizations, create a culture of doing more with less.

□ 1520

As it has been famously stated by a former Governor in Indiana: people will never miss the government that has been cut.

It goes without saying, with regard to individualism, people can do more for themselves and people can do more for each other than any faraway Federal Government program can. Let's continue leading by example. Let's continue this fiscal fight that we are engaged in. Let's pass—let's strongly support—House Resolution 115.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on the committee. I am pleased he is managing this bill today. It's good for the next generation of Members to learn the procedures of the floor this way—putting them right in the line of fire.

I would also like to thank the chairman for how she handled our marathon hearings. I've had her job and know how difficult it is to be juggling the schedules of all our fellow Members and of our fellow chairmen and ranking members.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, though, in opposition to this resolution. We have cut committee funding for the last 3 years. We are past the point of cutting what we want, and we are now into cutting what we need—our ability to attract and retain expert staff.

I asked the same question to every ranking member and every chairman who came in front of us. I asked them, if they're into cutting their personnel, whether or not they've thought in their own minds if it would hurt them in the jobs that they could do and in the jobs they do for the American people on those committees. Every man and woman said it would be an issue for them, that they would have a problem. Again, we cut in 2012 and gave people positions at lower salaries. These people, without question, make double, triple, four times the amount of money they can in the public sector. They're dedicated—they're dedicated people—but sometimes dedication doesn't pay the bills that they do acquire and that they do have.

Their main concern was keeping people on their staffs who had institutional knowledge, people who had the knowledge of how this House works. As you all know, when you first get here, it can be a quagmire—you don't understand what's happening; it moves too fast—but these men and women who are here for many years, they do know that, and they keep this train running. To hurt them and not be able to retain them would be a major, major disservice with just the institutional knowledge that they have.

Again, I get it. I understand the cutting. I understand we've got to cut some other people, but if we cut these staff members—the people who have been here—and try to attract other people who can do the jobs that our committee staffs do, I think that it would be hurting the American people.

We need to defeat this resolution and give the committees the appropriate resources that they need to do their basic work and to do what the people sent us here to do.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The fact of the matter is that this is all the money that we have to spend.

Believe me, I am sympathetic to the arguments that it would be nice if our committees didn't have to make any cuts. Again, if we don't make some cuts because of the sequestration, this money has to come from somewhere else. I guess we're sort of looking for other ideas of offsets for those who are saying that we should not pass this resolution.

What kinds of things would they offset?

We've certainly watched the White House close tours to groups because they said the sequester impacted the Secret Service's ability to protect the President when the American people came into the White House. I don't know if they're suggesting we should close the Capitol Building or what have you. I don't think that kind of suggestion would go very far.

But, again, where do you offset if you're not going to cut any spending here?

I will also say this: I come from southeast Michigan, which arguably was ground zero during the most painful economic transition, certainly in my lifetime, that happened in our Nation here recently, and we're trying to get ourselves out of that. We were number one in all of the categories you didn't want to be number one in. If I'd have told our local county or our local units of government that they'd have to cut 11 percent, they would say thank you, because they've cut anywhere from 30 to 40 percent. There were just incredible amounts of cuts that happened. Furloughs have happened with employees. That has been going on for years, actually. That's my neighborhood.

When we think about the amount of borrowing that we're doing as a Nation—as everybody knows, we are now to the point of \$16 trillion in national debt with no end in sight, and we've been running deficits for, certainly, the last 5 years of well over \$1 trillion and, in many cases, \$1.5 trillion annually, and we're borrowing 42 cents on every dollar that we spend—if we do not have the political will to make any kind of cuts ourselves to where we can't even cut our own committee budgets here in the House while these kinds of cuts are being absorbed by other areas, I just think that this resolution will be a very vivid demonstration of the differences of what we think “leading by example” actually means.

I will tell you as well, as a grandmother, I do not want to look at my two little grandchildren and say, Hey, do you mind paying the bill, because I don't have the political will. I just can't do it. Too hard for me. I don't want to break a sweat here. Would you mind paying?

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I just cannot get to that place. I think this resolution is very, very important. I recognize the painful cuts that are happening. It's not easy. That's why the American people sent us here—to have the political will and to make the hard

decisions. I would hope that my colleagues would support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Democratic whip and the former ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I heard the gentlelady from Michigan's comments. I have three grandchildren of my own and two great grandchildren. The gentlelady said we don't want to turn to them and say, We don't want to pay our bills. You pay them.

That's what we did in '01 and '03. We cut revenues. We cut revenues deeply. We didn't cut spending—we increased spending—on the theory that the people who were going to get the benefit were voting and that the people who were going to get paid and who were going to have to pay the bill weren't voting. It worked to some degree; but we didn't pay, as the gentlelady suggested we ought to, our bills. As the gentlelady probably knows, we had a provision in place which said we ought to pay as we go. If we buy a war, we ought to pay for it. If we buy a tax cut, we ought to pay for it. If we buy a prescription drug, we ought to pay for it and not ask my children or my grandchildren or your children or your grandchildren to pay for it. I agree with the lady, but that's what we've done.

Now we are about the process of undermining the people's government by slashing its funding so it cannot provide the services that the people want and need and vote for, and now we will slash the ability of this House to do what the people expect us to do. I'm sorry the former Secretary of State left the Chamber. He's the Secretary of State. He says we ought to lead by example. By golly, I'll tell you: the people in my constituency, they hope we're not the example of how to work. They hope we're not the example of the dysfunction that they ought to follow, that we're not the example of “do it my way or no way,” which is what we've been doing.

The people of the United States of America send us here, and they want us to make sure that we adopt policies that will help them and their families, that will create jobs and grow our economy. That's what they want. What the people of the United States also want is to make sure we can conduct the oversight of their government. That's our responsibility. The previous gentleman said, Well, the executive ought to lead, and then we wouldn't need to do oversight. I didn't get that, frankly, at all. The executive is a separate and equal branch of government, but we are the first branch of govern-

ment. We are article I. We are the people's House. We represent the people, and they expect us to make sure their government is operating properly. To the extent that year after year we reduce our ability to conduct the oversight necessary to ensure that the people's government is operating consistent with law and on behalf of the people of the United States—to the extent that we undermine that ability—we undermine free government, a free people, a free country.

□ 1530

We undermine the ability of this government to make sure that the executive is doing the right thing. And to the extent that the population of this country keeps growing, as it does every year, it needs us to be on the job. And what we're saying, of course, is: Well, we have a sequester. Sequester starts with “S”; it stands for stupid. It is an irrational policy that we've adopted. And we've adopted it. It just didn't happen. It didn't come out of the air. It didn't fall from the trees. We adopted sequester. It's an irrational, ineffective, inefficient, negative policy that we've not only allowed to go into place, but in the budget we passed, we adopted it one more time, not by mistake but by policy. It was a bad policy. I didn't vote for it. It's irrational.

I tell people around the country, you know, it's like the family has a budget. You have a food budget and you have a movie budget. Somebody loses their job and so your income goes down. So what you do is you sit around the table and say: We'll cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent. What rational human being would do that? Nobody. They'd say we're not going to go to the movies this month so we can put food on the table and make sure that our family is well fed.

But that's not what we're doing. The sequester that we're now pursuing, somewhat mindlessly, in my opinion, with respect to our ability to do the job that the people expect us to do, is to cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VARGAS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. My friends, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I want the American people to know we've cut committee funding for 2 years in a row because we understand that we're asking everybody to notch in their belt by one or two notches, and we ought to do the same. And we have. But if you undermine the people's ability to do their job, you're going to be in trouble.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote: “Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition.”

That's what we are here, we're on public exhibition. The TV is on, people are watching us, and people are seeing us.

But what Woodrow Wilson also said was: “Whilst Congress in committee rooms is Congress at work.”

That's where we really do our work. We vote on it here, but committees are critically important creatures of oversight and of action.

I think the gentlelady is a good Member of this House, and she's been given a tough responsibility. She laments the fact that we have no money. We have no money because we said we didn't need it; we have no money because we can operate government without it.

Mr. Speaker, I hear your gavel, and I will close, but I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. Let's make sure that the Congress of the United States can do the job that the people expect.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this committee funding bill, which would hurt the ability of Congress to do its work effectively.

This bill would cut the funding for House Committees by an additional 11% in order to meet the irrational demands of sequestration—on top of huge cuts imposed last Congress.

Committees have lost around a quarter of their funding in the past few years, and this has meant fewer staff positions and the possibility of furloughs.

Most, I think, do not realize just how important committees are to the work we perform on the American people's behalf.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote:

Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congress in its committee-rooms is Congress at work.

Eroding the ability of committees to do their work seriously limits the ability of Congress to engage in the people's work.

The Speaker and majority leader have said many times that this House ought to follow regular order.

To do so, we must have strong and fully functioning committees.

I urge my colleagues in both parties to oppose this bill.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minority whip's comments. I have great regard for him as well. I thought it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, listening to him talk about the President's sequester as an irrational kind of a thing. Of course, it was the President's idea. I don't dispute that it is not the best way to cut spending. Many may say it's an irrational approach. Again, the President's sequester, the President's idea.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Just so we're pretty accurate, as the gentlelady knows, your side offered a bill which was called Cut, Cap, and Balance. The alternative in Cut, Cap, and Balance was sequester. I didn't vote for that. I'm not sure how the gentlelady voted on it. It passed this House overwhelmingly with Republican support and with opposition on our side before Jack Lew suggested to HARRY REID that that might be one way to get off the lack of action in making sure that America paid its bills. The only reason I interrupt the gentlelady is because I think it is important to understand that your Cut,

Cap, and Balance, passed before that suggestion was made, included sequester as the fallback if we didn't reach the numbers. If it's the President's, it's the President's via Cut, Cap, and Balance which your side of the aisle passed and sent to the Senate as presumably good policy.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding. She was very kind to do that.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for pointing out the sequencing of the sequester, the President's sequester, the President's idea of the sequester, and I appreciate that. I still say with the President's sequester that what's going to happen with this vote is a very vivid demonstration, again, of who is actually committed to doing more with less. My colleague, the gentleman, the minority whip, also has given us sort of a historical lesson of various things in his observation of the way things had gone earlier on, and I would point something out as well since we are talking about committee budget cuts.

In 2007 when the other party, the Democrats, took control of this House, they immediately increased the amount of spending on committees by 8.9 percent, almost 9 percent; immediate increase. Then in 2009 as they kept control of the Congress, again they increased committee spending, that time by 8.9 percent. Now keep in mind, this was at a time—which I had mentioned previously, being from southeast Michigan—everybody else, it seemed like, certainly every State government, every local unit of government, every school district, many, many businesses, certainly American families, were making cuts. That was not happening here with committee spending.

In 2010, this House shifted control. The Republicans took control. And what did we do with committee spending as a way to show that we wanted to do more with less, that we understood that we needed to get a handle on this out-of-control Federal spending, we actually cut committee budgets by 9.5 percent for the 112th Congress, and as we are debating now, another 11 percent cut that we're looking at.

This is at the same time that the House, under Republican control, has also cut what we call our Members' representational allowances, our MRAs, which has been very painful for all of us as well. We cut 5 percent, then in the 6 percentile. Now just a couple of weeks ago, effective immediately with the sequester, another in the 8 percentile cuts for all of us. All of us are doing more with less. And believe me, I understand there's no sympathy for Members of Congress, but I certainly point that out.

At the same time if you look at non-defense discretionary for the executive branch, almost a 17 percent increase during that same time. So I just think when we look at this resolution, we see how important it is. Again, I am not minimizing how painful it will be for

the committees, but it's really the new reality, I think, and it's important for those of us here in the people's House to do the people's work with the amount of money that we have available, and to do it to the very best of our ability. And I know certainly Republicans and Democrats are committed to doing that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, you and I were in Rules last night when I made the statement that I'm going to make here today. When I was a child, I learned that you can be penny-wise and pound foolish.

What winds up happening here is for a protracted period of time, we have not been able to retain the kind of staff, the hardworking people that really do the grinding work in committees, as Mr. HOYER pointed out, and we leave them without the ability to get a raise. And I don't know about you all, but what's going to wind up happening with my staff is some of them are going to get better jobs because they are better served by going into the private sector.

If we want to retain good people, we have to pay good people. And at a time when the public is more aware of what we are doing and making more demands, as rightly they should upon us, we decide to put ourselves in a position to not be able to serve the public.

In the final analysis, some of what we are doing is trying to save our Republican colleagues. They get two-thirds of whatever it is that we're talking about. But we should not be ashamed of what we do here. We deserve the honesty that we would want the American public to expect of us as we conduct our work.

□ 1540

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I'd like to thank the chairwoman from the committee. She was very gracious during the committee hearing, and I learned quite a bit from her. I want to thank her for that.

And I, in particular, want to thank the ranking member. The ranking member gave me the opportunity to speak here. That normally doesn't happen to freshmen, and I really appreciate that. He has a reputation of being very gracious and kind, and I appreciate it. It was certainly demonstrated here today.

I do have to respond, however. There was the issue of immorality that was brought up before, and as a former Jesuit, I'm very comfortable with that type of language. And I believe it was said that leaving bills for other generations, future generations, was the most

immoral thing we can do. I certainly would challenge that premise. I think there's a lot more immoral things that we can do. However, when you do take a look at the issue of immorality and saying that we're going to leave this huge deficit, this huge debt to future generations, I think that that is immoral.

However, it's interesting, the argument on the other side is just simply the argument of cuts and not revenue. So, for example, corporate jets, there are loopholes for them now. We could close them. It wouldn't hurt the millionaires and the billionaires to pay taxes on them. It wouldn't hurt them one bit. And that, of course, would cut—it would cut the debt, the deficit that we leave to these future generations, reducing the immorality. We could have the wealthy, instead of paying 12, 13 percent on average, pay what middle class people pay. That certainly would cut the debt and deficit significantly, reducing, once again, the immorality.

But it's interesting, talking about immorality. The Bible certainly speaks to that. In Amos, the prophet Amos, if you look it up, you'll see that Amos speaks about the anawim, and the anawim are God's little ones. The little ones, then, were the orphans and the widows. Because of the condition that they were in, it was very difficult for them to survive. And we then, or at that time, the Israelites, were going to be judged on how they treated the anawim.

That carries forward into the New Testament. If you look in Matthew, Matthew 25, they say: How are we going to be judged? How are we going to be judged?

Jesus makes it easy. He says: whatever you do to the least of my brothers, you did to me. Then he goes through a litany of things. He says: when I was hungry, you gave me to eat; when I was thirsty, you gave me to drink; when I was a stranger—interestingly, when I was a stranger, we're certainly having that conversation with immigrants today—when I was a stranger, you welcomed me; when I was ill, you cured me. Interestingly, too, when I was a prisoner, you came and visited me. It didn't say if you were innocent, by the way. It didn't say that. It said: when I was a prisoner, you came and you visited me. That's how we're going to be judged.

And these budgets, these budgets should go towards those values. That's what's moral, taking care of those that are thirsty and hungry, those that are strangers. And these committees work hard to make sure that happens, and they do a very good job. In fact, no one's argued that they don't; just the opposite. What we have heard from the committee chairs is: don't cut us because we can do even a better job. And not only that, you're loading the work on us.

So I would conclude, and again thank the ranking member and certainly

thank the chair for the opportunity. And I would urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. I appreciate the opportunity, again.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, at this time, to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I've listened to this debate. It's primarily about the amount of money we spend on our committees here in the House. Taxes have just been inserted into it, and I have to respond to the comment about corporate taxes or tax breaks for corporate jets. It's an easy target. It's something the Democrats have repeatedly targeted in their budget resolution, something the President proposed to offset sequestration. And of course, the wealthy, with their big fancy corporate jets or corporate executives with their jets are easy targets.

But there is a lot of collateral damage any time this issue comes up. We forget about the people who fly those planes, the people who clean the planes, the people who fuel the planes, the people who run the facilities where those planes are hangared, the people who manage the flight operations, the people who manufacture those planes, which is, I would point out, the number one export industry in the State of Arkansas.

Much like in 1990 when the budget deal targeted the yacht industry in New England for a special luxury tax, it didn't raise the revenue that was projected. It did devastate that industry, leading to catastrophic layoffs, and resulted in the repeal of that measure within just a matter of months after it passed.

So while I appreciate the Democrats' desire to raise taxes every few months, I think that our spending crisis, or our debt crisis, is driven by spending, and we should be careful about singling out specific industries that provide good, high-paying jobs to hardworking Americans.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I certainly want to thank Mr. VARGAS for controlling his time. Mr. Speaker, he did a very good job. We certainly welcome him to the committee and look forward to working with him, as we also thank the ranking member, Mr. BRADY, for his extraordinary work on behalf of the committee, and we look forward to continuing to work with him.

Obviously, we have a bit of a disagreement, Mr. Speaker, on the committee budget cuts here; but I certainly would also applaud the work of all of our chairmen of our committees, as well as all of the ranking members, who very diligently went through their budgets trying to make the appropriate cuts and will continue to do that now, when this resolution is certainly passed, as we go forward, I think, for all of us, really, trying to create a fis-

cally responsible level of funding here and, again, something that allocates resources in the very best way that we can, that allows this House to complete its work on behalf of the American people.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would say, I believe that we are leading by example with this resolution today, and we need to show that the important work of government can certainly be done, and we can do it well with less. Doing more with less, that's a very well-used term, but it is certainly appropriate for this, during times of tight budgets.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 115, a resolution to fund the House standing and select Committees for the 113th Congress. As a member of the House Administration Committee, I have first-hand knowledge of the work that went into this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

As you know, with the implementation of the sequester on March 1st, across-the-board spending cuts took effect. In the wake of this, the House Administration Committee had a chance to hear from our colleagues—the Chairman and Ranking Member of each House Committee—about how they would handle the impact of the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Committee acted in a deliberative and fair manner when determining Committee budgets for the 113th Congress. Each Committee serves an important function, and while all will have to continue to produce good work with less, I am confident that they will succeed.

In the 112th Congress, the House recognized that economic difficulties were forcing the nation to tighten its belt. Rather than continuing runaway spending, this body chose to demonstrate that we were serious about getting our fiscal house in order by enacting an 11.4 percent cut in Committee funding. Today's vote gives us an important chance to show that, while families across the country are struggling to make ends meet, the House plans to continue leading by example.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this resolution includes cuts that will force Committees to make tough decisions. However, when the government faces across the board cuts, this institution should not be exempt. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 115.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 136, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—272

Alexander	Bachus	Barr
Amash	Barber	Barrow (GA)
Bachmann	Barletta	Barton

Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee

Olson
Owens
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—136

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers

Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Forbes
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Tahano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Pascarella
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—23

Aderholt
Amodei
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Fortenberry
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Harper
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Lynch
Miller, George

□ 1630

Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, PASTOR of Arizona, QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. COLE and LOEBSACK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 82, on consideration of H. Res. 115, a resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress, because I was questioning the Director the Federal Bureau of Investigation in my capacity as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I missed a rollcall vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on No. 82.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 25, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1614

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) or their designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to bring forward and present the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014. We believe that we owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget, and that is precisely what we are bringing to the floor today. Our budget balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes. Balancing the budget will help us foster a healthier economy, and it will help us create jobs.

In fact, two leading economists at Stanford University today released a study analyzing our budget and its positive effects on the economy and jobs. In the first year, they said it would, “boost the economy immediately,” increasing growth of our economy by a whole percentage point, which translates into about 500,000 jobs right away. That’s about \$1,500 in extra

take-home pay for families who are struggling to get by today.

By the end of the budget window, according to these economists at Stanford University, it would add 3 percent of economic growth to the economy. That's 1.7 million jobs in 1 year alone and about \$4,000 more in take-home pay because of higher economic growth. More take-home pay means more control, more freedom, and more prosperity for families.

We are not simply here to balance the budget because we like looking at clean spreadsheets. It is not even an accounting exercise. The reason we are balancing the budget is to improve people's lives. It is to bring needed health to the economy and to bring certainty to families and businesses so they can get ahead.

We know that a debt crisis is coming, Mr. Chairman. We know that it's coming because we've watched what other countries have done when they continue to kick the can down the road and ignore the tough choices they need to make to get our fiscal house in order. We're doing that.

Now, what are we trying to do specifically in our budget? We want to restore opportunity. We want to repair our broken safety nets so that they're designed to get people out of poverty on to lives of self-sufficiency by reforming our welfare programs. We want to make sure that the seniors who are relying on programs as important as Medicare actually get the benefits they organized their lives around. We want to make sure that the next generation, those of us who follow our parents into retirement, actually have a Medicare program we can count on. And we have those bipartisan reforms here.

Everybody needs to pitch in, and everybody needs to propose a solution to our problem because, Mr. Chairman, if we don't tackle this fiscal problem in America, it will tackle us.

Now, to their credit, the Democrats on the Budget Committee are bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Progressive Caucus is bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Black Caucus is bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Senate, finally, for the first time in 4 years, is bringing up a budget.

Budgets are about choices. The problem we have is not now that they're doing a budget—that's good news; that's great—it's what's in their budget. If you take a look at our budget—as I mentioned, our budget balances the budget. We believe a balanced plan is one that actually balances the budget. There is not another budget that's being offered here other than the Study Committee budget that actually balances the budget, other points notwithstanding.

Now, why do we balance the budget? Because we don't want our children to be drowning in debt. We want to make sure that this sea of red ink that the CBO is telling us is coming, we pay off our debt and give our kids a debt-free nation. That's what we do.

Take a look at the other budgets that are being offered. Let's take a look at the Senate Democrats'. That has a tax increase that's about \$1.5 trillion; that has a spending increase of about \$4.8 trillion off of our budget. If you take a look at the House Democrats', that's a \$1.2 trillion tax increase, with a spending increase of about \$4.896 trillion off of this budget. If you take a look at the Black Caucus budget, the CBC budget, that's a tax increase of \$2.8 trillion, with a spending increase of \$5.7 trillion, only to be outdone by the Progressive Caucus budget. That is a \$5.683 trillion tax increase with an \$8.698 trillion spending increase in their budget.

□ 1620

Taking more money from hard-working families to fuel more spending in Washington is not going to solve our budget crisis, is not going to balance our budget. It's more of the same. And more of the same means we have a debt crisis. When we have a debt crisis, everybody gets hurt. The people who are on the safety net, the seniors who have already retired, they're the ones who get hurt the first and the worst in a debt crisis.

This is a responsible plan. It's a plan for economic growth. It's a plan for tax reform. It's a plan to open up our energy stores that we have here so that we can be energy independent. We have vast amounts of energy reserves that we need to tap so we can put people to work, bring down gas prices, and stretch paychecks further.

We've got to control our spending appetite. We've got to reform programs like Medicare so they're solvent. We've got to reform our safety net so that it works to get people on their feet. That's what this budget does.

In a nutshell, instead of spending \$46 trillion over the next 10 years as we are currently poised to spend, we spend \$41 trillion. Instead of growing spending on average at 5 percent a year, we grow it at 3.4 percent a year.

So for all of the predictions of doom and gloom and how evil and terrible and horrible our budget is, it increases spending every year by 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year. The difference is we balance the budget. The difference is we let families keep more of their own take-home pay. The difference is we make sure our kids inherit a debt-free future. The difference is we do what's necessary to create a healthy economy, more take-home pay, faster economic growth, and better jobs. That's why we are here, to balance the budget.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last fall throughout this country, we had a vigorous debate. President Obama laid out his vision of how we deal with some of our big challenges with respect to the economy and the

budget, and Governor Romney did the same thing. Both of them said the American people face a very important and fundamental choice, and the American people chose.

They chose to support President Obama's vision of accelerating economic growth, putting more people to work, taking a shared-responsibility approach to our long-term deficits so we bring them down in a balanced and smart way, and they rejected the idea that we're going to move the economy forward by giving windfall tax cuts to the very wealthiest in the country and that somehow the benefits of that would trickle down and lift everybody up. They rejected that lopsided approach that balanced the budgets on the backs of everybody but the folks at the very top. It balanced the budget on the backs of our kids' education by slashing important investments.

In that category of spending that we make these important investments for our country and our future, they doubled the cut from the sequester. Those are investments in our kids' education. Those are investments in science and research to help power our economy. Those are investments to help modernize our infrastructure. They cut transportation by 15 percent when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, the American people rejected the kind of uncompromising, lopsided approach that we see once again presented here in the House. It is the same thing we've seen for the last 3 years, as if we hadn't even had a debate last fall.

In the Democratic alternative, we focus on the main issue right now and in the future. We don't only want strong economic growth in the future; we want to see accelerated job growth right now. We've seen some momentum in the jobs market in the last couple of months, but the Republican budget will put the brakes on that growth.

The chairman of the Budget Committee can quote economists all he wants. There are economists that say it will do this or it won't do this or it will do that. But we have an umpire here in the Congress. We have a referee. It's called the Congressional Budget Office. They're nonpartisan. They're independent.

They tell us if you follow the approach of the Republican budget and keep the sequester in place through the end of this year, that by the end of this year we will have 750,000 fewer Americans working than otherwise. Why would we want to do that?

They tell us that if you take the approach followed by the Republican budget, that economic growth this calendar year will be cut by one-third. Why would we want to do that?

The Congressional Budget Office also tell us that a full half of our deficit this year is as a result of the fact that there are still lots of people looking for work who haven't found a job, and they project that three-quarters of the deficit next year in 2014 is as a result of

the fact that you have too many people who are unemployed. So let's attack the root of the problem right now and help put people back to work rather than put the brakes on the economy. That's what our budget will do.

This calendar year, in addition to preventing the 750,000 lost, we will generate another 450,000 jobs by investing in the economy. Next year, the difference between our plan and our colleagues' plan is 2 million more jobs under our budget proposal.

We believe that you've got to deal with the budget deficit, and at the same time you also need to focus on the jobs deficit to help deal with the budget deficit.

We also reduce the deficit in a steady, sustained way. We do it with balance. We do it with targeted cuts. But we also do it, Mr. Chairman, by eliminating some of the tax breaks and tax expenditures for very high-income individuals.

We heard from Governor Romney and we heard from the chairman of the Budget Committee last fall and this year that there are trillions of dollars of tax expenditures that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people. Under the Republican plan, they say we're going to get rid of some of your tax expenditures for high-income people, but we're going to bring down your top rate. So in the end, the folks at the very top actually get a big windfall.

We say let's eliminate some of those tax breaks for very wealthy people in order to help reduce our deficit so when you combine that savings with targeted cuts, you can reduce it in a balanced way rather than increasing the tax burden on the middle class, which is what their budget will do.

We also want to make sure we keep our commitments to our seniors and not transfer the risk and cost of rising health care costs onto the backs of seniors as the Republican budget does.

We don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, as the Republican budget does, which means that seniors with high prescription drug costs will end up paying thousands more out of pocket over the period of this budget.

In our budget, we make sure that student loan interest rates, which are set to double in July from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, we make sure they don't double. The Republican budget makes sure that they do. That will make college less affordable to millions of students.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by talking about the deficit impacts because the Republican budget does hit this—they say they're going to hit this political target of balance in 10 years. But it's a hoax because they say at the same time that their budget balances, that they're repealing all of ObamaCare, all of the Affordable Care Act.

The reality, Mr. Chairman, is they get rid of all the benefits of the Affordable Care Act. So the millions of Americans who would have had more affordable coverage, they won't get it; and

the people who will no longer be excluded from getting coverage because of preexisting conditions, they'll make sure that they're denied coverage because of preexisting conditions because they take away the benefits.

But the dirty little secret, Mr. Chairman, is they keep the savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare. Without those savings, that budget doesn't balance.

So if we did what our Republican colleagues here say they want to do, which is this instant—repeal ObamaCare—they wouldn't have a budget that was in balance. You don't have to take my word for it. The Heritage Foundation, a very conservative think tank, just issued this statement: "Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this budget"—meaning the Republican budget—"is that it keeps the tax increases associated with ObamaCare." It keeps those.

It keeps all the savings in Medicare that were achieved as part of the Affordable Care Act where we achieved them by reducing the overpayments to the private insurance companies by changing the incentive structure to focus more on the quality of care rather than the quantity of care.

□ 1630

Do you remember all those Medicare savings that we heard our colleagues demagog in the last election last fall? They keep all those savings, and their balance wouldn't balance without them.

Our budget dramatically cuts the deficit and makes sure that our deficits are not growing faster than the economy, down to 2.4 percent by the end of the window. We stabilize the debt below where the CBO projects today, we stabilize 70 percent GDP. And, yes, we also will balance our budget in the same year that the Republican budget from last year balanced.

If this were just a race to balance the budget first, then people should vote for the Republican study group proposal—4 years. But if your priority is jobs and economic growth, as it should be as part of a measured and balanced approach to reducing the deficit, then you need to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say the gentleman from Maryland is right: yes, we do balance the budget. Guilty, and proud to be guilty of that. We think balancing the budget is important.

More to the point, in the revenues we are saying we don't like this current Tax Code, so we can raise the same amount of revenue as the government with a better tax system, one that is pro-growth, one that creates jobs. That is precisely what the Ways and Means Committee is doing. That does not include the ObamaCare taxes, but it includes replacing the current revenue

code that hurts jobs and hurts economic growth.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise because today's budget is the budget that helps American families. I rise today to support a budget that recognizes that the status quo is not only unacceptable to American families, but it is also unsustainable to the economy.

This budget that is before us now will finally restore much needed certainty, certainly to the economy, promote fairness, and provide those American families with the opportunity they are looking for to prosper. Importantly, this budget stops spending money that we simply do not have. At the same time, it advances commonsense changes in proposals to strengthen our Nation's safety net programs. We do that for American families.

So the Path to Prosperity takes us the first step towards reversing the path to debt and decline that the President and his fellow Democrats have laid out for the American people. To say that President Obama and the Democrats over in the Senate have failed to lead this Nation in what is probably the most predictable economic crisis in our Nation's history would be a drastic understatement.

Why is that? On February 4, the President's budget was due. On March 19, the American people are still waiting. It was over four times in 5 years that this President has failed to basically follow the law of the land and to submit a budget on time.

It is interesting that the President's brackets are always on time. His budgets, not so much.

The Senate Democrats are not any better. It took them almost 4 years to produce a budget that increases government spending by \$265 billion, raises taxes on this country by almost \$1 trillion; and, at the same time, it has cut health care providers by almost \$300 billion.

Over the period covered by the budget, deficits under the Senate plan are going to be nearly \$4 trillion—yes, \$4 trillion larger than those under the House Republican budget that we are talking about right now.

Every family, every family in the country, every family in America, they understand the necessity of having a balanced budget. The President and Senate Democrats could surely learn by going back to their districts and learning from the example of American families across the country in how to set a budget. Families don't have the luxury of waiting for the next election. They don't have the luxury, if you will, of going through yet another cycle. Quite frankly, as we stand here today in Washington, neither does Washington.

Let's stop the spending insanity, if you will. Let's start putting the country back on track, and let's do this for the American family.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, who recognizes how important it is to keep our economy moving forward, not backwards.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this ill-conceived budget. For working families this project could mean a tax hit of \$2,000, making it harder for families to afford rent and put food on the table.

The GOP plan also shortchanges seniors, ending Medicare in 10 years. Equally problematic, the Affordable Care Act would be repealed, reducing health care assistance to 176,000 families in my district and preventing 68,000 young people in my part of New York from staying on their parents' insurance.

We can also expect our economy to take a hit with 2 million jobs vanishing next year alone. Is this what we need to get this economy growing again? And for small businesses, this budget will mean losses. Sixteen thousand small firms in my district will lose tax assistance when purchasing health care, and thousands of would-be entrepreneurs around the country will see technical assistance and other services dry up, preventing the creation of new startups and blocking job creation.

Mr. Chairman, budgets should be about priorities. The American people rejected these flawed priorities last year when they voted to reelect President Obama. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so we can approve a budget that is balanced, that is fair, that will create jobs, and that will move our Nation forward, together.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget resolution.

I just want to take a moment, too, to applaud the chairman and the members of his committee, and especially the hardworking staff of his committee for producing this document—a mere little band of less than 30 staffers.

By contrast, the President, with all the vast resources at his disposal in the executive branch, is now, I think, into the sixth week beyond his deadline in which he cannot pass his own budget. I assume that he will one day submit something. I hope that we will have a chance to vote on it. I will be curious to see if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle can produce more than the zero budgets that his budget produced last year.

The Senate, however, is even worse. They haven't produced a budget in 4 years. After seeing the budget that

they will vote on, I now know, perhaps, why they did not produce such a document. It has over \$1.5 trillion in new taxes, almost \$1 trillion that are recognized, almost \$500 billion to replace sequestration in unspecified closures of so-called loopholes, and another \$100 billion in unspecified closures for new and ultimately failed stimulus spending.

And it never reaches balance—ever. The only thing we hear from balance on the Senate or the President is as a euphemism for new tax increases.

Finally, I want to point out that the last time the Senate passed a budget 4 years ago, I was a captain in the United States Army sitting at forward operating base Mehtar Lam in north-east Afghanistan. And I want to specifically single out the defense measures in this budget and to applaud, again, the leadership of the chairman and the Budget Committee for protecting our military, for giving it funding that it otherwise would not have and the flexibility it needs to help protect and keep this country safe. The Defense Department is the one area in government where the strategy should drive the budget, not the budget drive the strategy.

And the second way that it protects our military is from a debt crisis. This budget, as we have heard, is designed to postpone and ultimately prevent a debt crisis caused by out-of-control reckless spending in anemic economic growth of the kind you have seen in countries in Europe already.

If that were to happen, not only would it impact families all across the country when their interest rates for mortgages and farms and small businesses and education increase, but it also would crowd out all other kinds of priorities in our Federal budget. So it would immediately impact, as well, our troops, their families, and our veterans.

□ 1640

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, actually the Republican budget does follow some of our European friends, but follows them in the wrong way.

The strategy places like the U.K. have followed is an austerity approach—immediate deep cuts. And guess what that did? That sent them back into a recession. And again, the umpire around this place, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, said that if you take the approach in our Republican colleagues' budget, you'll have 750,000 fewer jobs by the end of this year. That is not a growth strategy. We cannot afford, here in the United States, the European-style austerity plan that is hurting those economies.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding me this time.

Today I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget, a budget that makes absurd claims to reducing the deficit by repealing crucial government authority to protect our economy. Lest we forget, the Lehman Brothers disorderly bankruptcy sparked the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Should a megabank fail in the future, the Dodd-Frank Act specifically authorizes regulators to dissolve the failing firm, fire its executives, wipe out shareholders, and deny the claims of creditors. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls this a bailout—erroneously—concluding that the Dodd-Frank Act enshrines "too big to fail" when, in fact, it provides all of the necessary tools to end it. If Dodd-Frank actually did what the Republicans say, why does no large firm want to be designated as "systematically significant"?

The Republican proposal also deceptively suggests that a repeal of the liquidation authority generates real savings to the American taxpayer. The Dodd-Frank legislation designed this authority to pay for itself over time, with any initial up-front costs being completely recouped by selling assets and imposing an assessment, after the resolution, on financial institutions with more than \$50 billion in assets. The law specifically states that taxpayers shall bear no losses from the exercise of any authority under the liquidation title.

Once again, the Republican budget is misleading and dishonest. The National Journal has called the Republican proposal a "budget gimmick," and even The Wall Street Journal dismissed it as mere "budget quirks."

If the authority to wind down a megafirm is repealed, the American taxpayer would be called on again to bear the risk of another financial crisis like in 2008, which the GAO found cost the U.S. economy \$13 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to my friend from Maryland.

He keeps saying that the CBO says this plan is going to cost 750,000 jobs. That's an analysis done on the sequester starting with looking at calendar year January through calendar year December. Well, where are we? This budget doesn't deal with fiscal year 2013. It starts in October. So he's using a comparison of a statistic that they use, the same kind of economic short-term analysis they used to say that the stimulus would create millions of new jobs. They're using the same kind of analysis and say the sequester will cost these jobs, and it's a cut that isn't even in this budget.

More to the point, the Senate Democratic budget has the same appropriations number we have in our budget for fiscal year 2014. The point is what the CBO does say over the long term, if you

achieve this kind of deficit reduction that we are, a million new jobs a year by the end of the budget window—a 1.7 percent faster economic growth. CBO says that about this budget, about achieving this kind of deficit reduction. Stanford economists. You can create a million jobs a year. So you're seeing a consistent theme here: cutting spending and growing the economy and creating jobs.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), a senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you've been to Spain or not, but I have, just once. It's a beautiful country—nice people, great food, and at one time a large, vibrant, and growing economy, but not today. Today in Spain, over half of the people under 25 years old can't find work. The unemployment amongst all ages in Spain is about what we had during the Great Depression—not the Great Recession, the Great Depression of the thirties. And people on government medical care there can't get it. They can't get it when they want it because they've had to close a lot of their medical clinics in order to save money.

They had to do that because they waited too long to fix their fiscal problems. They waited until they had a debt crisis, and then they had to do what my friend from Maryland said: they had to impose an austerity program. They raised taxes and cut spending very quickly in a matter of just a year or so because that's what they had to do to continue being able to sell their debt.

That, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what we don't want to do. This is not speculation. This is not something we have to think about. It's there for us to see, and not just in Spain and Greece and Cyprus—in Japan, in a different form. It's there in other parts of the world. When you borrow so much money that people won't lend you any more, then you put in this austerity which causes these problems.

Unfortunately, that is what my friends on the other side of the aisle, their budgets will lead us to. More debts, more deficits, kind of a sugar high. They'll say: Oh, yeah, we're going to spend all this money; we'll create all these government jobs. For awhile we'll feel good, until the debt crisis comes, and then all that goes away.

What the Republican budget does is balance in 10 years, and not so that CPAs like me can achieve some symmetry that makes us feel good. It's because when you balance the budget, you set this balance up. It frees up the economy. People know that we're on that track to balance in 10 years. We won't have a debt crisis. People will know we won't have a debt crisis. The economy is freed up from the burden of too much debt, of knowing that there's a problem with no solution. There will now be a problem with a solution.

The economy will be freed up, both on the government side and on the pri-

vate sector, and there will be more jobs and more jobs. That's what the Republican budget promises: an economy that grows and sustainable job creation, not a 1- or 2-year sugar high followed by a collapse. We've seen what not to do. We know the path not to take.

This Republican budget is the path we should take. I hope everyone will support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to point out again that our Republican colleagues cannot have it both ways. You can't claim you're going to balance in 10 years and claim that you got rid of all of the ObamaCare provisions, because if you look at this chart, you'll see in the year 2023, 10 years from now, they claim a balance of about \$7 billion, right there. And yet if you look at this blue section here and the red section, you've got the revenues from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare, and the savings from Medicare that our colleagues campaigned against last fall, but they kept them right in their budget. Without those items, they don't come close to balance. In fact, they're about \$400 billion short, in the 10th year, from balance.

We believe you've got to focus on getting the economy moving right now. That's why we call in our budget for getting rid of and replacing the sequester now, so you achieve the same deficit reduction over a longer, more measured, targeted period of time and don't do damage to the economy. And we reduce the deficit in a steady way so that it's way down below the growth in the economy by the 10-year window; and we do it in a way that is balanced, meaning we ask for shared responsibility. So we do it through a combination of cuts, but also we do say, for folks at the very high end of the income ladder, we can get rid of some of those tax expenditures, tax expenditures that our Republican colleagues have talked about, but not simply to reduce the rates for high-income individuals, but to help reduce the deficit as part of a balanced approach.

□ 1650

Now, if you look at the math on the Republicans' tax reform plan, it drops the top rate for folks at the very top from 39 percent all the way to 25 percent. We know that's going to cost about \$4 trillion. They say they're going to make all that money up by taking tax expenditures away just from high-income people. The math doesn't work that way. You're going to have to increase taxes on middle-income taxpayers, or you're not going to hit your deficit target, one or the other.

So in the Budget Committee, we Democrats said, look, let's say to the Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income taxpayers. And we had an amendment—I've got it right here—

Protect the American Middle Class from Tax Increase. We said, if you're going to do tax reform, at least make the commitment that you're not going to increase taxes on middle-income families in order to finance tax breaks for the folks at the very top. Every one of our Republican colleagues on the committee voted "no" on that amendment. The committee's got lots of policy instructions on other stuff, but a policy request statement about not increasing taxes on the middle class, they all voted "no."

So we believe we have to reduce our deficits in a smart and vigorous but also balanced way, asking for shared responsibility going forward, not violating our commitments to seniors by reopening the doughnut hole, not by shredding Medicaid, which they cut by over \$810 billion, and which would be one-third less in 2023 than it would otherwise be.

And, by the way, Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind people that two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to seniors and individuals with disabilities.

So it's not a question of whether we reduce our long-term deficits, it's how we do it, and we do it in a balanced way. If this was just a race to be the first to balance, then you should support not the chairman's budget. Support the Republican Study Group, that other budget. But if your priority is to grow jobs and the economy, then you should support the Democratic alternative budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to quickly respond.

So here's what my friend is saying, and I have three problems with what my friend from Maryland said. I have a problem with what he said in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end of what he said about all of what is happening here.

Here's his plan for economic growth: borrow more money and go and spend that money. Remember the stimulus? They're saying do it again. Then raise taxes. That's going to help the economy. Oh, and it's a balanced plan.

Here's the problem: their balanced plan doesn't balance the budget. We actually asked the CBO—they're claiming they will balance the budget in 2040. The CBO doesn't verify that. They're having to make assumptions that the CBO won't even back up to claim that they can somehow balance the budget.

But when I look at their deficits in their budget, yeah, they get the deficits going down in the first few years, and then it starts going back up. How on Earth do you tax \$1.2 trillion, net increase spending, and claim you're balancing the budget?

Look, we've been trying this economic program for a while. We tried the borrowing and the spending. That didn't work. We just hit the economy with a \$1.6 trillion tax increase. The

economy's not roaring right now. And what they're saying is let's do that all over again.

We are saying, fix the Tax Code. Replace it with a pro-growth tax system that helps small businesses, that helps job creators, that helps families. Get government spending appetite under control. The government is supposed to be spending 5 percent a year, on average, over the next 10 years. That's too much. That's more than the family budget gets. We say bring it down to 3.4 percent a year.

And so when you take a look at all of the smoke and mirrors, all of the claims, none of the Democratic budgets that are being brought to the floor here ever, ever balance the budget. How is that a balanced plan?

Balancing the budget is what every family does. Balancing the budget is what every business does. Balancing the budget is what every local government does. Surely our Federal Government can do this.

And one of the key ingredients to growing this economy, to making American businesses, big and small, competitive so that they can create jobs and give people more take-home pay, is to reform our tax system.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is in charge of reforming our tax system.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a Federal budget that balances so we can strengthen our economy, create more jobs, and allow American workers to start seeing an increase in their paychecks again.

I know we can do it. I was a part of a team, a Republican Congress and a Democrat President, that balanced the budget for the first time in a generation. We focused on areas where we agreed and we made some tough choices, and we should do that again.

Balancing the budget is not just about the economy. It's about critical programs like Medicare and Social Security and the benefits they provide to millions of Americans. Social Security is already spending more money than it brings in, and the Medicare trust fund is going broke fast.

What does that mean?

Well, if Congress and the President don't act, America's seniors will face significant benefit cuts. That means smaller Social Security checks, up to 25 percent less, and fewer doctors willing to take Medicare.

So what should we do?

First, we pass a budget that balances, and that's what Republicans are doing. The Democrat substitute continues a policy of borrowing and spending and raising taxes and never gets to balance. Our budget, with pro-growth tax reform, has been scored by outside experts to create a million jobs in the first year alone.

Second, we need to look at the areas where we agree with the President and start making the reforms necessary to save programs like Social Security and Medicare.

The President said he's willing to use a different formula, chained CPI, to determine Social Security benefit increases. I know that policy will be included in the RSC budget. It's an area of agreement between the parties. Well, Mr. President, if we agree, then let's do it.

The same goes for reducing Medicare subsidies.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an extra minute.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has yet to expire, but the gentleman has 1 more minute.

Mr. CAMP. The same goes for reducing Medicare subsidies for wealthier seniors.

The American people expect us to make progress where we can. Let's not let our differences stand in the way. And if we agree on a policy, let's come together to start protecting and preserving critical programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we actually have a kind of a yardstick that we can use to measure whether these budget approaches have a balanced approach, meaning that they ask for shared responsibility. You have the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles commission report, and they said we should reduce our deficits in a steady way through a combination of revenue, but also targeted cuts.

This Republican budget is totally lopsided. It provides tax windfalls to folks at the very top, and balances the budget at the expense of everybody else.

What we've proposed, actually, when you take into account the \$1.5 trillion in cuts we made over the last couple of years and the \$700 billion in revenue from January, and what we have in this budget, we actually have a higher ratio of cuts to revenue than that bipartisan Simpson-Bowles plan when you look at everything that's embedded in it. So that's measured against a bipartisan approach, and that gets us to where we need to be without hitting all the other priorities we have in our country.

With that, let me yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has looked at these numbers backwards and forwards, and I look forward to his comments.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. This Republican budget is tone deaf, the result of blind ideology. But, you know, I've been listening to what's been said so far today, and the Republicans say, but they don't say how. We've just heard, we know we can do it, but you don't say how.

□ 1700

So what we come up with on the Republican side is a mirage—and, I think, a dangerous one.

Let me give you have an example, talking about their proposals on taxes. Under their budget, the top rate is to be reduced from 39.6 percent to 25 percent. The AMT will be repealed. The corporate tax rate will be cut from 35 to 25 percent. But you won't find one syllable in the Republican budget on how all these tax cuts will be paid for. They don't identify a single tax policy that will end.

The Republican budget would mean a huge tax cut for the very wealthy—several hundred thousand dollars a year—and leave a nearly \$6 trillion hole in the deficit that would lead to tax increases for middle-income families. That isn't balance. That's total imbalance. At the same time, Republicans propose cutting \$3.3 trillion from programs for people with low or moderate incomes, including hundreds of billions of dollars from food nutrition and Medicaid programs.

So I want to end by asking when the Republicans come and talk about their tax proposals, name a specific that they would address. It's not in the Republican budget. Name one, name two, name three. Otherwise, it's worse than empty.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank Chairman RYAN for his distinguished leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I rise in high support of it. I also am very proud. It's one of the highest honors I have had in my short time here to serve on this committee, not because of chairman RYAN only, but because of the members. By members, I mean Republican members and Democrat members. I note for the Record that Mr. LEVIN is not a member of the Budget Committee. But there are great people who are. That's why it's perhaps because of some of that pride that I'm disappointed to hear the ranking member characterize the accomplishment—because that's what it is—the accomplishment of balancing within 10 years as some sort of political goal.

Families who are trying to put food on the table, neighborhood associations, nonprofits, and for-profit businesses, for that matter, that have to make a budget balance every day, every month, every year, I think should be offended by that characterization. It's not a political goal.

You know what's political, Mr. Chair? It's never balancing. You know what's political is the immoral idea that we are going to put more on our plate now, add up deficit after deficit, create a bigger and bigger debt, and then make people who don't even exist yet pay for it. Why is that political? Because, Mr. Chair, the people in the here and now can vote. Generations in the future, our grandkids who don't yet

exist, can't vote. And that's what makes the other approaches we've heard about immoral, wrong, political. We balance. We balance within 10 years.

Now let's contrast that a bit—our responsible approach—to what the Senate Democrats have done, for example. Next year alone, the Senate Democrats' budget increases spending by \$162 billion above what we're spending today. Over 10 years it increases our debt by \$7.3 trillion from today's levels, despite a massive tax hike that they have. And that tax hike adds \$1.5 trillion in new taxes. So even after that, they still add to the debt—our kids' debt, our grandkids' debt—by \$7.3 trillion.

Again, Mr. Chair, it never balances. After 4 years and \$6 trillion in debt since a budget was even last passed, the Senate Democrats' vague proposal leaves America with even more debt and government that never stops growing. Amazingly, after 4 years, the Democrats were unable to identify any real reforms—no tax reform and no entitlement reform. It's simply not a serious proposal.

I stand, again, in support of the House budget because it's responsible, it's real, it balances in 10 years, and it's the last thing from political.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Do you know what's wrong, Mr. Chairman? What's wrong is to pretend to the American people that you can have it all ways. What's wrong is to pretend that you've got a budget that's in balance in 10 years and pretend that you're getting rid of all of the Affordable Care Act, all of ObamaCare. What's wrong is going around the country demagoguing \$715 billion in Medicare savings, which we achieve by ending overpayments to private insurance companies and Medicare, and then using it to balance your budget and then saying, We didn't use it to balance our budget. That's what people don't like, is people trying to have it all ways.

We have taken an approach to steadily and rapidly reduce our deficits in a way that doesn't interfere and hurt economic and job growth right now. And we do it in a balanced way. And what I find astounding is to hear our Republican colleagues talk about the deficit and debt in one breath and then talk about all those tax breaks and expenditures that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people in the other breath and then say they won't close one single tax loophole for wealthy people for the purpose of reducing the deficit—not one dime in their budget for that purpose. And yet they're willing to hit Medicaid to the tune of \$110 billion. They're willing to hit the food and nutrition program by over \$100 billion. They're ready to hit transportation funding by over 15 percent in this budget window. And yet they're not willing to close one of those more than \$4 trillion in tax loopholes to reduce the deficit. I think that's wrong.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, a member of the Budget Committee (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. The Federal budget is a statement of our priorities and our values as a Nation. The budget should be fiscally responsible and reduce the deficit, it should make investments to grow our economy, and it should meet our obligations to our seniors, to our families, and to our future. And the Republican budget fails all three. The Republican budget threatens our Nation by undermining our economic growth and by shifting the financial burden for the deficit and for deficit reduction to our seniors and the middle class.

Republicans have made their choices clear: end Medicare as we know it, adding costs to seniors today and ending the Medicare guarantee tomorrow; slash investments for economic competitiveness; and give millionaires an average of \$400,000 in tax breaks. The Republican budget eliminates protections for millions of our sickest, frailest seniors who depend on nursing home and home health services. And the Republican budget will increase taxes for average middle class families by \$3,000. Their choices will cost 2 million jobs next year alone and decrease economic growth by 1.7 percent.

In contrast, the Democratic alternative preserves the Medicare guarantee; makes key investments in education, innovation, and infrastructure necessary for job creation and economic growth; and protects the middle class from large tax increases. The Democratic alternative reduces the deficit in a fiscally responsible and balanced way, without causing harm today and without threatening our economic competitiveness for the future. It reduces the deficit while meeting our commitments to our seniors, our frailest elderly, and our children.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget that threatens our seniors, our middle class, and our economic growth, and to vote for the Democratic alternative that builds on our great strengths as a Nation—an innovative, entrepreneurial business sector with a skilled, hardworking middle class. Vote for the Democratic alternative that builds on hope, opportunity, and security for all Americans.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentlelady from Pennsylvania said that we're ending Medicare as we know it. I've got news for you: ObamaCare ended Medicare as we know it.

And what our budget does is it takes those statements from Medicare and makes sure it stays in Medicare, that it doesn't go fund another program. Stop the raid of Medicare, make sure that those savings, as the gentleman says, are necessary and worthwhile, and stay with Medicare to make it more solvent, to extend the life of the trust fund and not double-count it, to raid it to spend on ObamaCare.

□ 1710

Loopholes. I enjoy this conversation, because what we keep hearing is: close loopholes for the purpose of deficit reduction. What it really means is: take more money and spend it in Washington. We're saying: close loopholes to lower tax rates for everybody.

The problem with our Tax Code is it's not fair. If you have access, if you have good clout, you can get a loophole in the Code and pay lower taxes. If you're a family sitting home in Janesville, Wisconsin, you're paying whatever tax rate. We are saying the person or the business that has the same amount of income should pay the same kind of tax rate.

With that, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, every business, every family, and every person in America eventually has to balance a budget. I am a small business owner; I still own a business. I have owned and operated my business for 41 years, and I balance my budget every month—and in many cases every day. The government should be no different.

Now, until we balance our budget, we don't know the true fiscal condition of our country, or our company, or our family. Just like a business that is overleveraged or a family that has overborrowed, deficit spending can obscure the real picture; but eventually the truth comes out. Once the numbers line up, you get an exact view of your fiscal condition. We've gone far too long without knowing our country's financial condition.

In the last 4 years, we've had trillion-dollar deficits. In 2011, our Nation's credit rating was downgraded. This year, our publicly held debt is on track to exceed 76 percent of GDP in 2013. Yet we still spend more money that we don't have, pushing the country towards a debt-driven financial crisis. If the Federal Government didn't have the ability to print money, we'd have a negative net worth, and we'd be in a weak financial position.

A budget is a blueprint. A budget is a roadmap; it's a plan. Our Nation's budget doesn't need to have balance as its end goal; it needs to be our starting point. It's the only way to guarantee that the public debt will not outgrow the economy, which would certainly crowd out private investment, raise interest rates, and increase inflation.

Now, I'm proud to stand in support of the Path to Prosperity. It's a responsible, balanced budget that is right for America. This budget balances, cuts wasteful spending, and fixes our broken Tax Code—all without raising taxes.

I applaud Chairman RYAN and my colleagues on the House Budget Committee for their tremendous work in presenting the American people with what they want—a budget that works. With this plan, we will apply the same principles that families and businesses use every day.

I predict our country's best financial days will surely be ahead of us, because unlike our Democratic friends, we balance. It means jobs, it means prosperity, and it means opportunity. Small business and the people of America are begging for this budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out to my colleagues that the Affordable Care Act, with the reforms it made to Medicare, we extended the life of the Medicare trust fund as part of that effort going forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Does that mean that money is not going to fund ObamaCare, and does that mean there's a \$716 billion hole in the funding of ObamaCare?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That means, as in your budget, that we will help reduce the deficit by whatever amount it was. But what we do not do in our budget is fund tax breaks for folks at the very top by raising them on folks in the middle.

Listen, let me say just one other thing here, Mr. Chairman. We've had four balanced budgets in this country in the last 40 years. It wasn't under President Reagan. It wasn't under the first President Bush. It wasn't under the second President Bush. It was 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001. It was under President Clinton. And then President Bush came in and did a big tax cut in 2001, putting us out of balance for a long period of time.

During the period of time when the budget was in balance the last four times out of 40 years, the revenue that was coming in was higher than it is in any year in the Republican budget that's before us now. What that tells you is that their budget approach is trying to seek balance on the backs of everybody else by really cutting into those important investments that have helped power our economy by violating important commitments to seniors and, in the end, by raising taxes on middle-income people. Why else would they not have joined Democrats in sending a policy statement to the Ways and Means Committee that says: When you go about eliminating tax preferences, don't hit middle-income taxpayers in the process.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the mortgage interest deduction, for example, the mortgage interest deduction really helps middle-income people—homeowners. So in addition to saying: Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't hit middle-income taxpayers, we specifically said: Don't take away the mortgage interest deduction for middle-income taxpayers. Again, all our Republican colleagues voted against that.

They've been talking about tax reform for 3 years now. We've never seen a piece of paper from them as to how they would do it, which is why we

wanted to make sure that they don't do it in certain ways that help middle-income people. But no, can't do that.

So let's make sure that as we address our deficit issues, we do it in a way that calls for shared responsibilities, not another round of tax breaks for the wealthy on the backs of everybody else.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), one of our distinguished members of the Budget Committee.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Well, this is an austerity plan and an inequality plan, this Republican budget. I want people to behold the plunder of suckling babes—the young, elderly, the infirm, women, communities of color—by \$810 billion cuts in Medicaid and \$135 billion in SNAP. It is not humorous to me. I want you to beware of the claims that we're going to grow our economy by ending 750,000 jobs, by pillaring Pell Grants, and cutting off educational opportunity to students.

This is not a balanced budget. This is a budget blunder which plunders us into double-dip recession. I'll tell you, Ben Bernanke, our Fed chair, warns against these kinds of severe austerity cuts. If you don't believe him, take the word of Plato. He said: In a state which is desirous of being saved from the greatest of plagues, there should exist among the citizens neither extreme poverty, nor, again, excessive wealth, for both are productive of great evil.

So we plunge poor people into poverty and give \$245,000 tax breaks to the wealthiest. I think that qualifies for not only an austerity plan that can harm us, but it is the greatest inequality plan that this body has seen.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think the reference to Plato reveals a mindset that the country ought to be run by a handful of philosopher kings instead of the people.

I yield myself 10 seconds to simply say this budget, this plundering, evil, cutting budget increases spending, on average, 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year.

With that, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this debate over the budget reflects a great struggle between American families and their government over whether they or the government can best spend the money that they have earned. This budget bends that struggle slowly back in favor of those families by returning to them a little of the freedom to spend more of their own money and make more of their own decisions once again.

The prosperity of American families is directly affected by government spending. Government cannot put a

dollar into the economy that it first hasn't taken out of the economy.

□ 1720

It's true we see the government job that's created when government puts that dollar back in. What we don't see as clearly is the job that's destroyed when government first pulls that dollar out. We see those lost jobs as chronic unemployment and a stagnating economy.

Every billion dollars spent in Washington means taking \$9 from an average family, either in direct taxes or in tax-driven price increases as businesses pass along their costs to consumers. That means that \$1 trillion of new taxes that the Senate has proposed means \$9,000 per family. Now we're told, don't worry, that's all paid by businesses. But businesses don't pay business taxes, they only collect them. They pass them on to us as consumers through higher prices, to us as employees through lower wages, or to us as investors through lower earnings, usually on our 401(k)s. A trillion dollars of deficit, as we ran up last year, really means \$9,000 of future taxes for every family, robbing our children of their futures.

It's about time we started thinking about these numbers in family-sized terms, because ultimately these numbers have a very real impact on families who are struggling to balance their own budgets, to set their own priorities and to look after their own needs.

Now, these days, we've passed more than one-third of the cost of government on to our children, and we financed the remainder through a tax system in which politicians pick winners and losers through an appallingly unfair and distorted Tax Code.

This budget calls for doing away with these tax distortions that reward some and punish others, distortions that shift capital away from economic expansion and into the service of political interests. This budget calls for flattening and lowering tax rates to assure that no American family pays more than one-quarter of its earnings to the Federal Government.

Those nations that have adopted similar reforms have been rewarded with explosive economic growth. That means fairness for every American taxpayer and an economy unshackled from the burdens and political favoritism of our current system.

In short, freedom works, and it's time that we put it back to work.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just to be very clear on what the Senate Democratic plan does and what the House Democratic plan does with respect to revenue, again, we heard from Governor Romney and others last year that there are about \$4 trillion in these distortions and preferences in the Tax Code that help very wealthy people. What we say is, we should get out some of that clutter, some of those preferences, and use some of that to help reduce the deficit. And we say at the

same time when you do tax reform, don't touch middle-income taxpayers, and when we asked our Republican colleagues to give us that assurance in the form of an amendment in the Budget Committee, they all voted "no."

So, yes, we think that you can eliminate some of the tax breaks and preferences that Mr. MCCLINTOCK just talked about, and you can use some of them to reduce the deficit. But the Republican budget won't use one dime of those to help reduce the deficit.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State who is both on the Budget Committee and on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. McDERMOTT.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, you've got to ask yourself what we're doing here today. We're fearmongering again. We spent last week, we spent the last campaign, we spent the last number of years really presenting to Americans that we're in imminent doom, and gloom is coming to America. We're going to be the next Spain, we're going to be the next Italy, the next Greece and probably tomorrow the next Cyprus.

Our debt is so bad, we're told, that we have to take food out of the mouths of children through the nutrition program and send seniors out with vouchers to take care of their Medicare. And then this weekend, an epiphany occurred. Speaker BOEHNER came on television and told the American people, "we do not—we do not have an immediate debt crisis." And Mr. RYAN, the chairman, was asked, and he agreed.

They finally told the truth. This is not about debt. If the Speaker and Mr. RYAN are right, why are they feeding us this Austerity Kool-Aid all the time? Why are they sabotaging the economy by throwing hundreds of thousands of jobs away in the sequestration? Why are they stunting our future by cutting the legs off our R&D programs and the National Institutes of Health? Why are they asking seniors, kids, the sick and the poor to go without health care and food security to pay for a fantasy crisis?

Why? Because they have needed an excuse to do what they've been attempting for generations to do, and that is disable the safety net; to get rid of Social Security, to get rid of Medicare, to get rid of unemployment, and to get rid of everything that makes a social safety net in a civil society. This charade is built on the fundamental deception that we are on the brink of an economic apocalypse so that politicians can wipe out the programs that people need so that they can give tax breaks to the people at the top.

The Speaker knows it, Mr. RYAN knows it, and it's about time the American people know it. You need not be afraid. Vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say

that was pretty good scaremongering if I ever heard any.

Like I said, the whole purpose of balancing the budget is to prevent a crisis from happening in the first place. What happened to Europe? They kicked the can down the road. They spent more than they could take in. They borrowed until they couldn't borrow at affordable rates, and then a crisis hit. We know that's where we're headed.

Look, the federal budget is growing at about 5 percent a year, and the family budget is growing at about 2½ percent a year. We want to get the family budget on course with the federal budget or vice versa.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, nearly 23 million Americans are still struggling to find work, and millions more low- and middle-income Americans are struggling with the reality of depressed wages, higher food and gas prices, and rising health care costs.

It is clear that the President's tax-and-spend policies are putting the American Dream further and further out of reach of more and more Americans. It's hard to get ahead in America when you can barely get by—paying your rent, putting food on the table and getting to and from work.

I believe the status quo is not working, and I believe that the American people deserve better than the chronically high unemployment, record levels of debt, unrealized dreams and a diminished future.

That is why I stand here today to urge my colleagues to support the House Republicans' Path to Prosperity budget. The Path to Prosperity budget funds America's priorities. It protects important entitlement programs, it saves our social net, it repeals the President's budget-busting health care law, reforms our broken code and balances within a decade.

President Obama and the congressional Democrats say that they want to get America back to work and support a "balanced approach" to our fiscal problems. But they also support record deficits and budgets that never ever balance. Instead of government living within its means, the Democrats' budgets raise taxes to fuel more spending, and in turn, millions of Americans remain out of work. The only place that these failed policies will lead is to higher unemployment, depressed wages and a crushing debt crisis.

The majority of Americans are not satisfied with the current state of our economy, and they're not hopeful about the future. And who can blame them? I believe the American people deserve better than the status quo, and I believe the American people deserve leaders here in Washington who are honest with themselves and their constituents about the challenges facing

our Nation and what it's going to take to get this Nation back on track.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. I urge the House to pass the Path to Prosperity budget and for the President to work with the congressional Republicans to balance the budget so that we can start to create the conditions for economic growth, job creation and more opportunities for current and future generations of Americans.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We heard earlier about the United States becoming Spain and others have compared it to Greece. The reality is that right now the danger is that we follow the European austerity measures that we've seen do damage to economies like that in the U.K., and that's what our Republican colleagues are calling for in their budget.

□ 1730

Yes, we need to reduce our long-term deficits, but we also need to make sure we keep the facts straight. And in the Republican budget pamphlet this year, they show this big tidal wave of red ink, which I believe the chairman showed earlier today, that's based on an outdated Congressional Budget Office analysis that doesn't take into account much of the deficit reduction we've done over the last couple of years, including the revenue in the fiscal cliff agreement. That's why the organization FactCheck.org said that the Republican budget proposal exaggerates future growth of the Federal debt in a chart contained in their newly released budget plan.

So we need to keep this in perspective, and that's what we do in our budget: we focus on economic growth now and economic growth in the future. And, yes, because of the reduction in the rate of increase in health care costs and using, actually, an assumption that the discretionary parts of our budget and mandatory we assume grow faster than the chairman asked the CBO to project, our budget comes into balance the same year as the Republican budget last year came into balance, but we do it without balancing it on the backs of other essential priorities that are important to the American people.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. I rise today to join my Democratic colleagues on the House Budget Committee to staunchly oppose the budget proposal we have considered last week in committee.

Mr. Chairman, I was not in Congress last year when the budget was considered in the House, but it sure seems like my Republican colleagues want to make sure I didn't miss a thing since

the proposal before us today represents little more than the same recycled, unrealistic policies that have been rejected by both the Congress and the American people.

This is a budget based on bad math and unrealistic assumptions. It keeps the savings and revenue from the Affordable Care Act, but it repeals its benefits to the people. It cuts taxes for the wealthiest without identifying how they'll pay for the trillions, and it takes almost a trillion dollars in unspecified cuts that will likely target programs for the needy and disadvantaged. With all those unrealistic assumptions, I am surprised there's not a provision that requires leprechauns to steal the pots of gold at the end of rainbows and then to count that as revenue. Mr. Chairman, that could have been a trillion dollars and you'd have a surplus now.

Mr. Chairman, while the math may be bogus, the budget will have real and serious effects on the people of Wisconsin. It keeps the sequester in place, which costs the people of Wisconsin 36,000 jobs; and across America, that's 2 million jobs. It will turn Medicare into a voucher program, forcing 850,000 Wisconsin seniors out of traditional Medicare, eventually, people like my mother. And it will raise taxes on middle class families by more than \$3,000 while giving the richest a \$245,000 tax break.

We need to balance the budget responsibly by getting people back to work. That's the best way to reduce our deficit. We need to create jobs. Economists of both stripes say we should do it and the CBO says we should do it. We need to get it done.

I urge my colleagues to reject the backward-looking plan from our friends on the other side of the aisle and, instead, embrace a forward-looking plan on job growth.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to say I simply dispute my friend from Wisconsin's interpretation.

This is the chart the gentleman from Maryland was talking about. Guess where we got this chart from? The Congressional Budget Office. It's the most recent numbers they've given us. Will they give us new numbers this summer? Yes. And guess what? It's still going to show a whole bunch of red ink. We can't wish away this debt problem. One year of spending and \$3 for every \$2 that you're taking in, you've got a problem. We've got to deal with that.

We know we're giving the next generation an inferior standard of living. If we keep down this path, we will have a crisis, yes. That's not fearmongering. The gentleman was talking about the fiscal commission. Erskine Bowles, President Clinton's chief of staff, says this debt is a cancer on society, that we will have a crisis. The problem is: there are Democrats who agree with the facts; it's not the Democrats who are writing these budgets, though. That's our problem.

Mr. Chairman, we're going to have to come together sooner or later to deal

with this. That's why I want to yield 4 minutes to the vice chair of the Budget Committee, a gentleman who's offered lots of wisdom on this committee, the doctor from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. RYAN for his remarkable leadership on this and many other areas.

Mr. Chairman, it is no wonder that folks are confused out there. I tell you, there is so much misinformation that is coming, and the fearmongering that is coming from the other side is truly remarkable. So let's try to set the record and the motive straight.

Republicans care about seniors starting at devastating reductions in Medicare under current law. Republicans care about workers and middle class folks fighting to make ends meet with increased gas prices and increased food prices and on and on. Republicans care about young people struggling to get started in careers and being crushed by government rules and regulations. Republicans care about students getting out of school and not being able to get a job in their field. Because we care about seniors and workers and single moms and young people and students, because we care about all Americans, we present this responsible, balanced budget.

Budgets, Mr. Chairman, are about priorities. Priorities that the American people overwhelmingly support include getting Federal spending under control—poll after poll tells you that—getting our economy moving again so we can get folks back to work, and getting our debt crisis under control so that we may preserve the American Dream for future generations. These are precisely the priorities of our House Republican budget, the Path to Prosperity.

This Path to Prosperity is the way to responsibly balance our budget. American families all across this great land know that the Federal Government shouldn't spend more than we take in, and we agree.

Let's look at a couple of specific items.

Our friends talked on the other side about loopholes. We're interested in closing loopholes, you bet. The gentleman from Maryland says not one dime of closing loopholes will go to reduce the deficit on our side. He's absolutely wrong, Mr. Chairman. He's just wrong. I've had this discussion with him. He is simply wrong. It's really sad that he perpetuates that misinformation.

Second, taxes. The gentlelady from Pennsylvania said that we were interested in raising taxes by some remarkable amount. I can't even remember what it was. In fact, we don't. We actually balance the budget without raising taxes.

Mr. Chairman, they can't have it both ways. They can't say that our plan is not specific enough on taxes and then say it's so specific that we increase taxes by a specific amount. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, as

you know and our friends on the other side of the aisle know, it's the Ways and Means Committee that develops the tax plan. That's why the Budget Committee doesn't address it.

As a physician, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that taking \$716 billion from Medicare and spending it on something else means that seniors are not going to have the kind of quality health care that they need, and that's why we go get that \$716 billion. We'll bring it right back to the Medicare program. It's imperative to do that to keep quality health care in this country.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Then, finally, they talk about slashing and severe cuts to spending. Mr. Chairman, our budget increases spending by 3.4 percent every single year, on average, and we do that because that's the number that you need in order to bend the curve down so that we do indeed get to balance.

Mr. Chairman, the Path to Prosperity ensures that we're honoring America's most important priorities. Our budget saves and strengthens and secures Medicare. We protect national security. It cares for the poor and the sick by repairing America's safety net programs. And we expand economic opportunities for all.

We believe in the industriousness and the ingenuity and the dreams of the American people. It's time that we have a government that is worthy of the people that we represent.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's start with taxes. What the Republican budget does is provide a windfall tax break for folks at the very top. People listening can do the math. You're dropping the top tax rate from 39 percent to 25 percent right off the bat. That's about a cut of one-third in the top rate for millionaires. That's a huge loss of revenue.

How do they make up that revenue? Well, if you're going to really make sure you don't increase the deficit, math tells you you're going to increase taxes on middle-income people to help pay for those tax breaks, which is exactly why we offered an amendment in committee saying, okay, Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle income folks. They voted against that. There are lots of other provisions in the Republican budget that provide guidance to other committees, but they didn't want to provide them that guidance.

□ 1740

So the point is that they provide tax breaks to the folks at the very top while leaving middle-income folks vulnerable; but on net, they do not close one tax loophole out of those four trillions to reduce the deficit. Do you

know how we know that, Mr. Chairman? Because their revenue line is constant with the baseline. So Mr. PRICE is just dead wrong when he says they close tax loopholes to increase revenue for the purpose of reducing the deficit. It's not in there. It's just dead wrong.

Now let's get the record straight about what the Republican budget does to different groups that Mr. PRICE referenced:

Seniors. Here is what the AARP, the largest organization representing seniors, says about what the Republican plan will do:

The chairman's proposal fails to address the high costs of health care and, instead, shifts costs on to seniors and future retirees. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work is not the answer.

That's the AARP.

The Medicaid cuts. There are \$810 billion in cuts. Again, I'll remind people that two-thirds of that goes to seniors and people with disabilities. Here is what the nonpartisan, independent Congressional Budget Office said would be the impact of those kinds of cuts:

It means, because they block-grant the program to States with a lot less money, States would need to increase their spending on these programs, make considerable cutbacks in them or both. Cutbacks might involve the reduced eligibility for Medicaid and CHIP—that's children's health—the coverage of fewer services, lower payments to providers, or increased cost sharing by beneficiaries, all of which would reduce access to care.

So whether it's in Medicare or in Medicaid, we violate commitments to seniors in this budget.

He talked about kids and education. Their budget would allow in July the doubling of the student loan interest rate from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, making college less affordable. Our budget makes sure there is not that doubling.

Also, we had an earlier conversation with Ms. MOORE about the impact of people in poverty. I'll just give you one example:

In the category of the budget that helps with the Women, Infants, and Children program—this is the program that helps pregnant women and women with very young children get nutrition assistance—they double the sequester cut. Then they tell us it's not going to have any impact—not on that and not on doubling the sequester cut on the National Institutes of Health and the research they do. Somehow, magically, all that will be funded even though you double the sequester cut—more than double it—in that category of the budget.

So their budget, while providing these windfall tax breaks to the folks at the very top, and their budget, while slowing down economic growth in the economy right now, also means we undermine other important priorities in our country.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to a new, distinguished member of the

Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I rise to oppose the Republican budget for a very fundamental reason: it would be devastating to the health and well-being of America's seniors.

This budget raises seniors' costs for preventive services; it reduces access to nursing home care; and it reopens the Medicare prescription drug doughnut hole, which means that, for seniors with high prescription drug costs, they could end up paying on average \$13,000 more over the next 10 years. The Republican budget also tries, once again, to end the guarantee of affordable coverage under Medicare by converting that program into a private sector voucher that will not keep up with costs; and that's going to leave seniors, who are on fixed incomes, holding the bag.

The Republican study group budget is even worse. It forces chained CPI on Social Security. What "chained CPI" means is, quite simply, reduced benefits for seniors who've paid into the system, earned those benefits, need them, and are counting on them.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for a budget that protects billions of dollars in special interest tax breaks for the wealthy and for the most powerful corporate interests while reducing benefits for seniors and shredding the social safety net.

My 83-year-old mom is like millions of seniors around this country. She did her part by working hard all her life, paying into the system, paying her taxes; and when she retired, she counted on a guarantee that her government would honor its end of the bargain. I intend to make sure that it does. We can reduce the deficit without forcing extra costs on the middle class, seniors and the most vulnerable in our society, and that's why I'm supporting the Democratic budget alternatives, which do four essential things:

One, they honor our commitment to seniors; two, they focus on jobs and economic growth, which is a far better way to balance our budget; three, they maintain our safety net; finally, fourth, they keep us on the path of health care reform, which is going to bend the costs that are creating these problems.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, another chart. The red line shows where spending is going. These are Congressional Budget Office numbers. The green line shows our historic revenues. The blue line shows the additional revenues that President Obama has called for. He has already gotten a big chunk of this—he just got \$617 billion—but even if we got all the tax increases that President Obama and his allies in Congress are calling for, it wouldn't even pay for a fifth of all the deficit spending that's coming.

This is where spending is going. We are spending ourselves into a debt crisis. We will never, ever balance the

budget if we keep spending growing at the pace it's growing right now. We have to do something about this because, if we don't, our families will receive a bankrupt country; economic growth will slow; and our kids will be guaranteed a diminished future. We owe it to our countrymen, to our economy, to our kids to get this under control.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, also a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I do want to thank Mr. RYAN for his leadership on this budget.

Mr. Chairman, we've talked a lot about the big picture. I want to make it personal.

In the early 1990s, I lost my job in a corporate merger. For about 48 hours, I moped around, feeling sorry for myself; but then, one morning, my wife and I got up. We made a pot of coffee, and we got out a sheet of notebook paper, and right down the middle of the page we drew a line. On one side, we wrote down: this is what we have coming in. On the other side, we wrote down: this is how we're going to spend it. We shed some tears that morning as we made difficult decisions. The reason I tell that very personal story is that there is no question in my mind that, today, there are Americans sitting at their kitchen tables—with that same piece of paper, shedding those same tears.

Before I got here, I served in the State senate. I chaired the Appropriations Committee, and I worked with the Democrat chairman in the State house as we made difficult decisions in balancing our State budget. Families, State legislatures, small businesses around this Nation are making those difficult decisions. They have every reason to expect their policymakers in Washington to do the same thing.

I support this budget proposal because it does make tough decisions and balances our budget. I support this proposal on behalf of my mom and dad, who worked all of their lives and paid into a system, and their government made them a promise that said when you get to age 65, we're going to provide you with health care. Yet the actuaries for that system say that their government is in danger of not being able to honor its promise.

I support this budget on behalf of my parents because this budget says we repeal a system of unelected bureaucrats that will make health care decisions for them. I support this budget on behalf of my children and their peers who are entering the workforce, yet are facing job creators with an uncertainty of what's coming out of Washington. I support this budget on behalf of my two grandchildren, to whom I will not be part of passing on a debt that will jeopardize their future.

We hear our friends on the other side of the aisle say, Well, what we need to

do is raise taxes so that we can spend more. We're going to tax this current generation \$1.5 trillion more. We're going to tax future generations so that we can spend more.

That is not the right approach. That's why I support this budget.

□ 1750

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just to be clear in terms of the Democratic proposals, if you take our budget proposal here together with the work that we have done over the last couple of years, which reduces spending by over \$1.5 trillion, \$700 billion in revenue, take that all together, means \$4 trillion in deficit reduction over that amount, over the period of the window, and we do it in a balanced way. We don't do it the same time we are providing windfall tax breaks to folks at the very top. We don't do it on the backs of other important priorities. We do it by growing the economy and asking for shared responsibility, so we have shared prosperity in this country.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the so-called Ryan budget Path to Prosperity, which really should be called the Ryan budget "Mainline to Misery for the Middle Class." Budgets are a reflection of our Nation's values, and it is clear that the House Republicans chose to favor the ultrawealthy over the weak, the sick, the poor, and the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, this is just more of the same old, same old: more tax breaks for the wealthy, an end to Medicare as we know it—they don't care anything about Medicare—broken promises to our seniors, and higher taxes on the middle class.

For the middle class, this Ryan budget is a road to ruin. For the middle class, this Ryan budget is a shortcut to suffering. Issuing vouchers for health care and gutting programs for low- and middle-income Americans at the expense of budget-busting tax cuts for the wealthy is not the best way forward for our Nation.

I look forward to supporting the Democratic budget, which reduces the deficit in a balanced way while strengthening the economy, bolstering the middle class, and investing in our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. There are too many points to refute, so I won't bother trying.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. RIBBLE.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

It has been quite an afternoon already: slash, cut, tone deaf, burn, plunder, shred, eviscerate, end Medicare as we know it, balance the budget on the backs of our seniors, and then my fa-

vorite, austerity Kool-Aid. There has been enough hyperbole in this room today, I should have brought my boots.

Let's talk about austerity. We talk a lot about the least fortunate about us, the concern for seniors and for veterans and the most needy. This is what the budget actually does. These are the real numbers. I have read the real budget—not somebody's report on the budget, but the real budget.

This is what we do for veterans. We increase from \$145 billion to \$187 billion. That's a 20 percent increase, a 20 percent increase over a decade. That is a \$1.675 trillion commitment to our veterans.

Then I heard we are going to end Medicare as we know it. Well, \$509 billion to \$864 billion in Medicare over a decade, if this is austerity Kool-Aid, I don't know how you can define \$6.656 trillion as austerity Kool-Aid.

I have heard a lot of people say I'm concerned about my mom. My colleagues have said it on both sides of the aisle. I want you to know, moms, we have got your back to the tune of \$6.656 trillion. We are here for you.

Let's look at Social Security. We hear that Social Security is going to be in trouble. Well, this budget goes from \$854 billion to \$1.423 trillion. So what does that come out to? Well, it is just a meager \$11.15 trillion over the next decade on Social Security alone.

So what does that do for these three programs? Three programs, Mr. Chairman, this is our austerity Kool-Aid: \$19,481,692,000,000 on three programs, nearly \$3 billion more than the accumulated national debt in the last two centuries. If this is leaving our seniors behind, if this is leaving the most fortunate behind, I don't even know what we can do to make it right other than this.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the budget you have put together, and you achieve balance, including meeting these demands for the least fortunate in our society.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think Mr. RIBBLE made some very, very important points for all of us in this debate, and that is: the reason you see spending rising in both budgets is primarily because we have so many more baby boomers becoming eligible for Medicare and Social Security. In fact, what this chart shows is that, over the 10-year window, you are going to see about a 33 percent increase in the number of people eligible for Medicare and about a 30 percent increase in the number of people who are eligible for Social Security.

So what we say in our budget is that, if we are going to meet our commitments to these seniors but also reduce our budget deficit, we have to do it in a balanced way. Because if we meet these commitments and at the same time are trying to reduce our deficit, one way to do it is the way the Republican budget does: to more than double

the sequester cut in all the areas that are important to growing our economy, our infrastructure investment, our kids' education, science and research. They also cut Medicaid, which affects a lot of those seniors on Medicare. About 20 percent of those seniors are also on Medicaid.

But it is at the end of that 10-year window that our Republican colleagues then move to their voucher plan, premium support—I don't care what you call it. The only way you are going to achieve any savings compared to the baseline number, CBO baseline that the chairman showed you, the only way you are going to do it is if you are capping the amount you are going to get so that seniors have to eat the costs and take the risks of rising health care.

There is a better way to address that issue, and that is the way we approach it in our budget. And that is to build on the kind of reforms that we made in the Affordable Care Act in ObamaCare, which have helped and contributed to reducing the rapid rise in per capita health care costs and which, as I pointed out earlier, our Republican colleagues included in their own budget.

So, yes, we have to deal with these drivers of costs, including health care. But the way we propose to do it is not by transferring or offloading those rising health care costs on the backs of the seniors, but by moving Medicare away from a strictly fee-for-service system toward one where we reward the value of care over the volume of care. And that has achieved significant savings, and it has done so without any negative impact to Medicare beneficiaries. So very different approaches to this issue.

Mr. RIBBLE pointed out there is spending going up that is to meet these commitments. But if you don't take a balanced approach like we do, you can only address those issues by undermining other very important national priorities, priorities that have always had bipartisan support in the past.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. GREEN.

□ 1800

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time.

Mr. Chairman, depending on your point of view, there is something in this budget for you to like and to love. If you like repealing the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with nothing, then you love this budget.

If you like having senior citizens pay more for their pharmaceuticals in the twilight of life, then you love this budget.

If you like having 26-year-olds and under come off of the insurance policies that they're currently on with their parents, then you love this budget.

If you like the notion that health care should become wealth care in the

richest country in the world, where one out of every 100 persons is a millionaire, then you love this budget.

If you like the whole concept of having voucher care, as opposed to Medicare, then you really love this budget.

My dear friends, I neither love it nor like it. I'm against it, and I won't vote for it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That was very entertaining.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

There are two ways to deal with Medicare essentially. And I think most people would agree, Medicare has a big problem. It's going bankrupt. And the gentleman from Maryland talked about demographics and health inflation.

ObamaCare changed Medicare as we know it. ObamaCare puts a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats in charge of Medicare. These bureaucrats, by law, are given the assignment to require Medicare cuts each and every year to hit the targets that will lead to denied care for current seniors.

We disagree with that. We think patients and their doctors should be in charge of their health care. We believe in choice and competition so that seniors have guaranteed coverage options to make sure that they can have a plan that best meets their needs.

Now, is this some pie in the sky theory?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Let me show you a chart.

By the way, a voucher is, you get a check and then you go buy something. No one's proposing that. It's a good poll-tested word.

Premium support is a bipartisan solution, the only bipartisan idea offered on how to save Medicare. It's how the prescription drug law works today.

When the prescription drug law was passed, it was expected to cost about \$100 billion when we began, on an annual basis. What happened to the actual cost?

It came down 41 percent below cost projections. Let me say that again. The prescription drug law came in 41 percent below cost projections. Name me a government program that comes in 41 percent below cost.

Why did this one do that?

I'll tell you why. Seniors got to choose the plan that meets their needs.

The plans, the drug-providing plans, had to compete against each other for the seniors' business. They compete, so they lowered their prices, they improved their quality. Customer satisfaction is at an all-time high. And lo and behold, costs went down.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I'll give myself 30 more seconds to say we believe in putting seniors in charge of their health care, not 15 bureaucrats. Our budget does not change the Medicare benefit for anybody in or near retirement.

But to guarantee that that promise can continue to be made for my mom and the other moms that we've been talking about, to guarantee that it's there for my generation and my kids' generation, you have to reform the program, and that's why we want this bipartisan idea that has proven to work, versus giving the control to 15 bureaucrats.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, balancing our budget goes way beyond taxes and spending. It will define who we are as a Nation and ensure prosperity and opportunity for all Americans going forward.

According to two prominent Stanford University economists, John Cogan and John Taylor, the Ryan budget would raise gross domestic product by 1 percentage point by 2014.

Well, just what does that mean?

They explained it. It's equal to about \$1,500 for every household in the United States—\$1,500 for every household in the United States. By 2024, they estimated GDP would increase by 3 percentage points, to \$4,000 per household. That growth, that kind of growth can't be ignored.

Putting our budget, moreover, our economy, on a sustainable budget, is a moral imperative, and we owe it to the men and women retiring tomorrow, as well as my newest granddaughter, who will be born in April.

The Ryan budget also recognizes that our current tax structure is holding our Nation's prosperity back. I applaud the goal of collapsing our Tax Code to just two lower rates of 10 and 25 percent.

We need pro-growth policies that will grow our economy and create jobs. Tax reform is the answer. At the end of the day, we don't need more taxes; we need more taxpayers, and new jobs will do just that.

Containing the size, scope, and cost of government has got to be a priority here. The more money siphoned from the economy to support government programs means less money in the economy to support private investment, innovation, job creation and wealth for all Americans. We've done this before and we can do it again.

I listened with a little bit of incredulity as I listened to the gentleman from Maryland do a little bit of revisionist history. He talked about the late nineties, and gave the credit to the President for balancing the budget.

Well, I was here in the Republican House of Representatives, the first Republican House of Representatives in 40 years, and I like to take a little bit of credit for that too. I think that the Republican Congress got the ball rolling.

But at the end of the day, I don't care if the President takes the credit for that. In fact, after we passed welfare reform three times, finally, the President kind of came along, kicking and screaming, and he signed welfare reform into law. And 50 percent fewer

families in America have to rely on welfare. They have jobs.

I'd like to see us balance the budget, not just for my children, but for my grandchildren. And I'll tell you what: if President Obama's willing to do that with us, like President Clinton reached across the aisle to a Republican Congress, I will be happy to be the first in line to give him credit for that because I believe all America will benefit.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to respond to a few of the comments from the chairman with respect to Medicare and health care costs.

As we indicated earlier, we've seen a dramatic slowing in the per capita interest in health care cost. That's a good thing. That's, in part, we believe, a result of changes in the Affordable Care Act and, as a result of that, the so-called Independent Advisory Board that our colleagues misleadingly refer to as a bunch of bureaucrats won't even have any job to do for at least 10 years, probably longer.

Now, if health care costs per capita start rising more quickly, then their task—and this is a group of health experts and others—their task is to propose a way to reduce those health care costs, and they're specifically instructed not to have a negative impact on beneficiaries.

And by the way, it specifically says, if Congress has a better way to do it, go for it. That's what the law says. We think that that's a better approach than handing everything over to insurance companies.

And the Republican plan to give seniors a voucher, premium support—I don't care what you call it, it's bad news because seniors will be getting this thing, but the value of that thing doesn't keep up with the rising health care costs.

Now, the chairman mentioned prescription drug part D. It came in under projected cost. One reason was you had more generic drugs on the entire market, not just the Medicare market. But the other, major reason was, guess what? There were 25 percent fewer people enrolled in part D. So you had fewer participants and so, obviously, it costs less. Twenty-five percent.

Now, it's simply wrong to say that the Republican voucher plan for Medicare is like part D prescription drug, or like the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, which we've heard about many times before, because the difference is, and it goes to the core of this issue, both those plans, part D and the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, have provisions that ensure that the premium that is provided by the government, or Medicare, keeps up on a percentage basis with rising health care costs. That's why it's called premium support, and that's why the Republican plan is not premium support because it does not keep up with rising health care costs, if they're going to claim the savings it makes.

And here's a chart that illustrates this. This is current Medicare. Seniors are putting in a certain amount, and they're guaranteed a certain percentage of support from Medicare.

□ 1810

Here's the plan for Federal employees and Members of Congress: Members of Congress and Federal employees put in around 25 percent and the program picks up the other 75 percent. And as costs go up, the Federal Government still picks up 75 percent. Here's what happens with a voucher program where the value of what you get doesn't keep up with the percentage rise in health care costs. You, the beneficiary, the senior, pay more and more. And that's the only way it can work if you're at the same time going to show that congressional budget chart that shows all that spending out into the future. The only way you can bring that down under the plan is to cap the value of premiums. And that's not premium support; that's a voucher. And that's the end of the Medicare guarantee.

I now yield 2 minutes to a great new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the ranking member for yielding and thank him for his extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Chairman, budgets should reflect our priorities and our values. It should protect American families by investing in education, infrastructure, science and research, clean energy, and housing. Budgets should be designed to grow our economy and get people back to work.

This Republican budget does not reflect the values of our great Nation. It will hurt our economy and it will hurt the American people. As Yogi Berra said, "It's déjà vu all over again." More of the same. More tax cuts for the richest Americans, billions in subsidies for Big Oil, tax policies that benefit companies that ship American jobs overseas at the expense of the middle class and the working poor.

As a reflection of our Nation's values, our Federal budget should honor the commitment we've made to our seniors; but this Republican proposal would end the guarantee as we know it, shifting rising health care costs to seniors. We should be educating our next generation of leaders to enter the workplace successfully, and we should be making meaningful and serious investments in rebuilding our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, our bridges, roads, and schools so it will put people back to work in well-paying middle class jobs that help support a family.

But this budget makes deep cuts in rebuilding America and in education. According to the Center for American Progress, the Republican budget proposal on the floor today would cut \$1.2 trillion from investments in education, science, and infrastructure, hurting our economy. And some have projected that it would result in the loss of 2 million jobs.

The budget before us today does not reflect our values as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote against it and to support the Democratic alternative. It's a budget that really speaks to the highest ideals of America—the kind of America that will provide the best education for our kids, that will discover new cures for disease, that will develop new, clean energy sources, that is committed to rebuilding our crumbling roads, bridges, and ports, and an America that honors our promise to our seniors and to our veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative and vote against the Republican Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute.

I enjoy the back-and-forth on Medicare. Let's not forget that under our proposal there's no cap on Medicare growth for current seniors. We don't have the cap like ObamaCare does. ObamaCare caps Medicare and then has this board of 15 bureaucrats decide how to affect current seniors to make it live within its cap to its price controls. We don't do that. We say leave Medicare alone. People like my mom organized their lives around this program and retired on it. Don't change a thing. Don't put some cap with bureaucrats price-controlling it. The premium support we're talking about, that's for future seniors. And if you're poor, if you're sick, if you're middle income, you get a lot more subsidy—total coverage for poor people—than the wealthy.

I keep hearing all this talk about wealthy. We say the wealthy should pay more for their own premiums than everybody else. That helps us save Medicare for the next generation. These are ideas that actually have bipartisan support—the only bipartisan idea on how to save Medicare versus the rationing from the IPAB board.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee, a member of the Budget Committee and a member of the Commerce Committee, Mrs. BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, our chairman, for the outstanding work that he has done, and to all of my colleagues on the House Budget Committee for how diligent we've been in bringing forward a budget that is responsible and is a credit to our citizens and to the American people.

I think it really is quite amazing when you listen to some of this rhetoric. Mr. Chairman, it is so evident from listening to this debate that we have friends across the aisle who just really believe that government can never get enough of the taxpayers' money. I don't think they can tell you how much is enough, because they're always going to find ways and reasons and new programs and new ventures or investments, as they like to call them, to spend that money on.

Every time we talk about accountability and responsibility of the House

to manage the people's money in an accountable and responsible way, they start to talk like that money is theirs, and that we're talking about taking that money away from them. But it's the people's money. And what the American people have said is they want to see this government on a spending plan that is going to be accountable and is going to be responsible. And they want a budget that is going to balance and they want us to get this deficit spending and our national debt under control. Now, the document that we're bringing forward is something that is going to do that. And it's going to do it in the appropriate way because we meet our obligations and we honor the commitments and the promises that have been made.

I heard someone talk about shredding the social safety net. Well, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, when our friends across the aisle brought forward ObamaCare, they're the ones that took a whack into that social safety net by making those spending cuts in Medicare and pushing that money over to stand up a new program. We don't stand for that because what we will do is preserve Medicare, as the chairman has said, for today's seniors and give younger workers an option that is going to honor the work that they are doing now in paying into that system.

I think it's important that we look at how this is going to affect our children and our grandchildren. I have two grandsons, Jack and Chase. They're here this week. I'm delighted they're here in budget week because the decisions that we make this week are going to be decisions that they're going to bear the burden of. Money we spend is money they will pay back. It's imperative that we be responsible to our children, to our grandchildren, to future generations and meet the obligations we have today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It's extraordinary how many times we have to point out that the Republican budget before us today contains the Medicare savings that were first demagogued last fall during the Presidential campaign. We hear them attacked here on the floor of the House by our Republican colleagues, and yet they're in the Republican budget. In fact, they're in this Republican budget. And what's more, their budget wouldn't balance without them, which is why they cannot have it both ways and claim their budget is in balance and they're getting rid of ObamaCare.

Now, while they're keeping the savings, they are getting rid of all the important benefits in the Affordable Care Act that will provide more affordable health care, which will make sure people can't be denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, will make sure that kids can stay on their parents' insurance policy until they're age 26.

For 3 years in a row, we've had a bill from our Republican colleagues called

Repeal and Replace: repeal ObamaCare, but replace it with something else that provides affordable care. Three years. We've never seen replace. There is no replace. You can look through the Republican budget. There's no replace. Just like for 3 years they tell us they've got a tax reform plan that's going to magically provide these big tax cuts for people and not hit middle-income taxpayers. Not one piece of paper out of the Ways and Means Committee in 3 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's a little tiresome to continue to hear people criticize savings that we achieve without touching beneficiaries, which our colleagues include in their budget and which extended the life of the Medicare trust fund by more than 8 years.

I now yield 1½ minutes to somebody who knows a lot about the importance of Medicare and Social Security, the gentlelady from Illinois, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

□ 1820

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, the Ryan Republican budget reflects everything that the American people rejected in the last election: asking nothing from the wealthiest Americans and rich corporations that ship our jobs overseas, while turning Medicare into a voucher program and slashing investments that create real jobs.

Inequality is at its highest point since the Great Depression, and yet this budget would make it worse. Here's the top 1 percent. Since 1979, look at how their income has gone up—277.5 percent. This is the bottom 99 percent. You see a little bit of increase, but you see where the money has gone.

Well, households making more than \$3.3 million would get an average tax cut of \$1.2 million. Those who make less than \$22,000 would get \$40, and a third of them would get no tax cut at all. Meanwhile, critical support programs for seniors and the poor would be cut, including drastic cuts to Medicaid and the food stamp program.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ryan Republican budget. It's pure March madness, and not in a good way.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman is correct in saying that the savings that are in the Affordable Care Act for Medicare we apply back to Medicare. That's correct. We think that money should stay in Medicare to extend its solvency and not be raided from Medicare to spend on ObamaCare.

He says we keep the savings but we don't keep any of the benefits. President Obama said that premiums would go down by \$2,500 if we passed ObamaCare. They've gone up by \$3,000, on average. I don't call that a benefit.

The costs of the bill have gone from \$938 billion to \$1.88 trillion. It's a budget buster. It doesn't pay for itself. I don't think that's a benefit.

Next year, young people are expected to see their premiums go up by 145 per-

cent to 189 percent. I don't think that's a benefit either.

So, yes, we don't want these benefits. We don't think turning Medicare over to a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats to cut it in ways that will surely lead to denied care for current seniors is a benefit. That's why I want to yield 2 minutes—well, that's not why, but I also want to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a former member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today of the balanced budget put forward by my friend and chairman, PAUL RYAN, and the reasonable and practical approach that this Budget Committee has taken while they budget hardworking taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this budget debate goes deeper than spreadsheets and focuses on the longevity of the American Dream.

Today, we are considering a Republican budget that actually balances in 10 years, calls for pro-growth, pro-job tax reform, and strengthens Medicare for our seniors and future generations, while in the Senate, HARRY REID and PATTY MURRAY are considering a budget that never balances. It increases taxes by \$1 trillion and let's Medicare and Social Security race towards bankruptcy. And it turns Medicare into a program that rations benefits to seniors.

Make no mistake, Washington is approaching \$17 trillion of debt and more than 12 million Americans are unable to find work. The decisions we make will either sink us deeper into debt or put us on a path that encourages job creation and restores the belief that, if we work hard and make tough choices, our kids will inherit a stronger country.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is clear. If Hoosier families balance their budgets, Washington doesn't have an excuse. It's time the President and the Senate offer real solutions for hardworking Hoosier families.

I commend Chairman RYAN and the House Budget Committee for their hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to another terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentlelady from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget plan. This misguided and cruel plan abandons the economic recovery. It is a path to greater disparity, and it protects the affluent while further squeezing the middle class.

We cannot afford this Republican budget. According to the Economic Policy Institute, it will cost us 2 million jobs in 2014. This is on top of the 750,000 jobs we will lose this year due to sequestration.

The Republican budget attacks the various industries where the largest

job growth should be occurring. We need to invest in critical infrastructure like the health care system as a key way to create jobs here at home and protect our most vulnerable.

According to a 2012 Bureau of Labor Statistics study, the health sector is going to be the leader in job growth throughout the rest of this decade. Unfortunately, the path once again chosen by Republicans in this Congress will put job growth in jeopardy.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that the budget plan under consideration cuts \$2.5 trillion from health care by 2023. How? It turns Medicare into a voucher program and it block grants Medicaid to States. This will force health care providers to cut jobs and to reduce services to their patients.

With an aging population that will require greater care, we should be investing in critical infrastructure like health care and other programs like disease and care management, which have and will continue to reduce spending in Medicare.

So let's be clear: this budget wreaks havoc on health care systems in this country, it hurts patients, and it devastates future job growth in the health sector.

Lastly, this plan also chooses to arbitrarily balance the budget in 10 years, which is harmful to our fragile economy and middle class families. The notion that 10 years is the magic number to balance the budget is ludicrous. It is similar to telling mortgage holders who are responsibly paying their mortgage that, instead of having 30 years to pay it off, now they have 10. Would they be able to? Many of them would end up losing the house. That is exactly what the Ryan budget does and why, to the Nation's budget and to our economy, it puts us under water.

Instead, I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the Van Hollen substitute, which is a balanced approach that leads to job creation and is the right way forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Budget Committee and also the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

This is what principled, visionary, responsible leadership looks like. I commend Chairman RYAN and the entire team for this budget and for insisting on regular order. I also congratulate this body for finally forcing the Senate to do something—introduce a budget.

We owe it to our fellow Americans to be honest about the complex fiscal challenges and options before us. That's why today's debate is one of the most important we will have this year.

Nearly every day I hear from my hardworking constituents from southwestern Riverside County who have struggled tremendously over the last 5 years. Despite the challenges they face, they continue to make ends meet by

making tough fiscal decisions, whether it's for themselves, their families, or for their businesses.

Most Americans don't understand why their elected officials can't do the same. Instead, they see us jumping from one crisis to the next, putting their lives and their well-being on a constant roller coaster. Frankly, I don't understand it either.

You can't hide from the statistics. You don't have to be on the Budget Committee to understand our fiscal situation. A balanced budget is not a radical idea; it's a responsible one that the citizens of Riverside County and those around this country practice themselves.

Economists across the spectrum agree that our current path is leading us to a debt crisis should we fail to act. Make no mistake: we're on the warning track, and we should reverse course before we slam into the wall. All Americans should have real concern about what this means for the future prosperity of their own families and of our own Nation.

Under the Obama administration, U.S. public debt as a percentage of GDP is over 70 percent and growing.

□ 1830

As we've see with European nations, there appears to be a tipping point in the debt-to-GDP ratio, and at our current rate we are nearing dangerous territory. The reserve currency status of the dollar and our rank among world economies will only carry us for so long.

So what effect does this level of debt have on an economy and its citizens when things go south?

All you have to do is look at countries like Cyprus, Spain, and Greece. In the case of Greece, you see a depressed environment where the unemployment rate is over 26 percent; severe austerity cuts and overhauls have gutted worker benefits and the safety net system, harming seniors and the country's poorest populace; taxes on families and businesses have increased at a sharp rate; and divisive and violent social unrest has become commonplace. Most recently, we have seen a proposal to bail out Cyprus banks that would raid the savings accounts of its own population.

These are the realities of a debt-ridden country. These are the realities of liberal policies that tax too much, spend too much, borrow too much, and produce far too few jobs. We cannot afford the path that we're on.

Thankfully, we have time to change America's course, and the House Republican budget provides a 10-year plan. It puts the brakes on our unsustainable spending levels, lays out thoughtful program reforms to ensure essential government services are solvent for generations to come, prioritizes a comprehensive restructuring of our Tax Code to simplify the system, and improves our fiscal condition in a way that will allow our econ-

omy to grow providing opportunity to those that work hard no matter what station in life they start at.

Fortunately, after being prodded along, the Senate is joining the House in this conversation after a 4-year absence. I don't favor their approach to the task before us—a plan that never balances with more failed stimulus spending and additional tax hikes. I suspect the President's budget will be similar, once we finally we receive it. However, we welcome their proposals because we will have clear options laid before the American people, and we can have a comprehensive and honest discussion about future choices.

Vice President BIDEN famously said: Show me your budget and I'll tell you what you value. Well, with no budget submitted, we're all forced to conclude that the White House values delay and obfuscation.

Even given this nonfeasance, as an optimist I know this process will allow us to find common ground. Addressing issues of this magnitude is never easy or pretty, but it is a process worth taking. House Republicans continue to stand ready to work with the President and our Democratic colleagues in Congress to meet the complex challenges before us so that we can get our Nation back to a path to prosperity. Thankfully, the House Republican budget does exactly that.

With that, I urge a "yes" vote on H. Con. Res. 25.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, who's been very focused on these budget issues, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman, and I thank Mr. RYAN.

The focus and goal of this budget, as I understand it, is to eliminate the debt. That's a worthy goal. In fact, we all share it. But this budget, in my view, lacks ambition for other challenges. What about stagnant wages? Middle class declining? Lack of jobs? These are all fundamental issues that face the American economy.

The middle class is shrinking. Wages now are what they were as a level of our economy as they were in 1966. Just a week ago, when we voted for the sequester, it was a day when American profits were at a record higher than they had been since the 1950s, but American wages were back at 1966 levels.

There is an assertion here that we lack credibility and that we're taxers and spenders. I reject that. But let me remind the folks on the other side that a lot of the policies got us to this debt: a war in Iraq on the credit card, Afghanistan on the credit card, two tax cuts for the wealthy promising benefits to everybody else never paid for, and Medicare part D on the credit card. Then we had the collapse of the economy. Those were not our policies. Those were the policies of a previous President who erased a record surplus.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. These are credibility questions, but there's also an economic policy question. There are two assumptions in this budget. One is that austerity will lead to prosperity, that getting the debt down by any means possible and any cuts possible will get us to the Promised Land; it's the pot of gold at the end of the Tea Party rainbow. There is no evidence for that whatsoever.

The second is a faith-based conviction that if you give tax cuts to wealthy people that will trickle down to the rest of us. No experience has shown that that can be successful.

We should be cleaning up the Tax Code. We should be fighting waste, fraud, and abuse. Whether it's in the Pentagon or in the health care system, we should be doing that together. This budget does not give us that chance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself just 30 seconds to say that austerity is what we're trying to prevent from happening. That's the irony of this debate.

Austerity is what happens after the debt crisis hits. Austerity is what is happening in Europe. Austerity is cranking up taxes, slowing down your economy and cutting benefits on senior citizens after they've retired. That's what austerity is. That's what they call it.

We're preventing that. We're preempting that. The goal of this budget is a reasonable plan to balance the budget, to grow the economy, and to create more take-home pay so families can prosper.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to a new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm honored to serve on the House Budget Committee. I'm honored to advocate on behalf of this budget.

There's one thing for sure: we can't keep going the way we are. If you look around the world, if you look at countries like Cyprus, Spain, Portugal and Greece, you will see the consequence of unrestrained spending.

The Republican plan balances in 10 years. The plan offered by the Senate never balances. And when we say "balance," we mean matching revenue to spending, not spending more than you take in. When our colleagues across the aisle talk about balance, they use it as a code word for a tax increase.

The Republican plan offers protections across the spectrum of American life. It offers our seniors the protection of making our promises good in Social Security and Medicare. No one will deny—OMB will tell you and the CBO will tell you—the Medicare trust fund is going broke. It will expire in 11 short years; and the longer we wait to deal with that, the worse the problem becomes.

It protects our middle class through tax reform and through repealing the

ObamaCare law with its onerous regulations and taxes. It will structure our system for economic growth. We will stop hemorrhaging American jobs overseas, and we will bring American jobs back to these shores. It's one thing if we lose jobs because of low wages overseas. We don't ever want to compete in that arena. It's another if we lose jobs because our government is inefficient, bloated, and expensive.

Finally, it protects our most vulnerable. It protects our young people. I agree with then-Senator Obama when he said it was immoral to continue to incur these massive debts. Of course, since he said it, our debt is multiples of what he was decrying at that time.

We are piling mountains and mountains of debt on our children and our grandchildren to fuel our addiction to spending. It's got to stop, and it's got to stop now.

I'm proud to stand for this Republican budget, and I urge its passage.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, under our budget proposal, the deficit is dropping rapidly, but we also address the jobs deficit so that we make sure more people get back to work. With respect to the Medicare trust fund, I would just point out the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, extended the life of the hospital trust fund by 8 years. And if Republicans did what they said they want to do, which is repeal it, they would shorten the life of the trust fund to 2016. But even though they don't want to tell us, they apparently have kept that in.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut who has worked so hard to make sure that college is affordable to students in this country, Mr. COURTNEY.

□ 1840

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, as we talk about the issue of young people and debt, one thing is very clear: for 7½ million young Americans who receive subsidized Stafford student loans, in 103 days the interest rate on those subsidized student loans is going to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

We have before us now two budgets. One budget, the Democratic budget brought out by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, protects the lower rate. The other budget, by the majority party, allows that rate to double to 6.8 percent.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York came out with a study just a few days ago which shows, in fact, that the student loan debt for young Americans has tripled over the last 8 years.

We have one budget which protects Pell Grants, which reduces the need to borrow money to pay for college, and we have the other budget from the majority party which freezes Pell Grants at \$5,665 a year. Any parent like myself who has kids in college, any student who is in college who believes that over the next 10 years that tuition is going to stay flat obviously has no understanding of what the trends are and have been over the last 20 years in

terms of State withdrawal for higher education support, and what's actually happening out there in the real world.

We have one budget which speaks to the monumental challenge of young people who are trying to improve themselves and get ready for the workplace of the future; we have another budget which is blind to those challenges and which will reduce college to a system of haves and have-nots.

We must invest in young people in the future. The Democratic budget, which protects the lower interest rate and the subsidized Stafford Student Loan program, understands that. The majority budget, which allows those rates to skyrocket, which freezes Pell Grants so that young families from poor backgrounds will not be able to afford the cost of college, again leaves this country basically behind in the competition for high-value jobs, for jobs that require skills, whether it's in science, technology, engineering and math or other areas of curriculum.

The fact of the matter is for young people, there is only one budget which speaks to them and addresses their needs—that's the Democratic budget that is brought out by Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 seconds to say the interest rate cliff in student loans was put in law by the Democrats in the first place.

If we bring legislation to the floor that is paid for to deal with it like we did last year, I would assume we have every reason to believe that we'll pass it.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to a new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to hear my friends across the aisle talk about investing in our future and investing in our economy. But when they talk about that, I think we have to be clear that that's code for borrowing and spending more money.

We should truly talk about the cost of this debt. We all know today that we owe \$17 trillion in debt, and if the Federal Reserve stopped printing money, the actual cost to service this debt, to pay the interest payments would be about \$500 billion.

You go out 10 years and our debt is going to be \$25 trillion. And minimally to service our interest payments on that debt 10 years from now, it's going to cost us \$750 billion a year, or \$7.5 trillion over 10 years.

If you talk about the cost of interest payments every year to service the debt, that's \$750 billion that isn't going into education, it's not going into health care, it's not going into roads or schools or helping our poor. It's \$750 billion that goes to interest payments.

When you talk about investing in our future, we're not doing that. We are mortgaging our children's future. But let's be clear. There is someone who is investing in their future—it's the Chinese. They're investing in their future

by buying American debt. So when my little girls, my little 2-year-old Mari Vi and my 4-year-old Paloma, when they get to be our age, they're going to have this weight of interest and debt around their neck and they're going to pay those payments back to those Chinese preschoolers.

This is not responsible. And to hear my colleagues across the aisle stand up and talk about a balanced approach that continues this course of massive red, this is what our children inherit and say this is what we want to give to them?

Listen, if you ask moms around America, Is this what you want for your children? Is this what you want them to inherit? Is this how you want them to invest their tax dollars? They would resoundingly stand up and say, Heck no. Be responsible. Pay off the debt. We don't want them to have their massive tax dollars go to interest payments.

My friends across the aisle, they talk again about borrowing and spending and investing in our economy. When they use that language, it sounds eerily familiar to the same language they used 4 years ago. This is the same argument that was used to borrow a trillion dollars to help us grow our economy, create massive new jobs.

The bottom line is that that trillion-dollar stimulus failed. We want a responsible approach, balance the budget, grow our economy and put our hard-working middle class families back to work. The Republican budget actually does that.

I ask all my colleagues to actually support the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a couple of things that were just said.

The first is that when President Obama was sworn in—in fact, before he even put his hand on the Bible a little more than 4 years ago, we were losing over 700,000 jobs every month. The economy was actually spiraling downward at a faster rate than it was at the time of the Great Depression. And thanks to the resilience of the American people and the emergency actions taken by the President and others, we stopped the free fall, we turned the corner and there have been 36 consecutive months of private sector job growth, more than 6.4 million jobs created.

We didn't get any help from our Republican colleagues when we had to make tough decisions to prevent the total collapse of the economy. Now that we've seen some momentum in the job market, we have a Republican budget that's going to put the brakes on that growth. That's according to the Congressional Budget Office. By the way, their budget includes the assumption of those continued sequestration levels into the next year.

Let's talk about China for a minute. I got a letter the other day from the CEO of a major biotech company. Here's what he said. He said that over

the last couple of years because of the reduction in our national investment in science and research, he laid off 1,000 people. And because of the continuing sequester, they've imposed a hiring freeze right now. Those are jobs that now will not be created that would have been otherwise if we hadn't had the Republican approach to the sequester.

You know the real kick? I heard Mr. DUFFY talking about China. They're hiring people in China. Not because of lower Chinese wages, but because China has decided to make science and health care funding a national priority. In other words, the Chinese are copying the secrets to our success, things that help our economy grow, things that are slashed in the Republican budget. Did I say "slashed"? Yeah. Because they cut that portion of the budget by more than two times the sequester. That's a fact.

If we're talking about competing with the Chinese or the Indians or the Europeans or anybody else who is out there, one of our global competitors, let's not allow them to borrow the secrets of our success while we're ignoring them here at home.

I now yield 2 minutes to a terrific new Member of the Budget Committee, someone who has been focused on and leading a lot of our anti-poverty efforts, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for your tremendous leadership and for yielding. And I also thank Chairman RYAN for a very spirited markup.

I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget. And let me just say as a new member of the Budget Committee, I've had the opportunity now to really get into the weeds of the budget, which really is full of choices, but those choices would undermine our Nation's future for the continued benefit of special interests and the wealthy.

The bottom line: that's what this budget does. It would dismantle government, it would increase inequality and leave the most vulnerable people on their own.

We should reject this warped vision of America, and we should call this budget for what it is. Republicans call it a "path to prosperity," but it really is a path to poverty for the middle class, for working families, for children and for our seniors.

□ 1850

The fact of the matter is, you cannot pretend to fight poverty while you make brutal cuts to the very programs that lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

The Republican budget would make devastating cuts that will increase child hunger, cut off millions of seniors from access to health care, and throw struggling families off TANF during the middle of a jobs crisis. The Republican budget proposes yet another \$6 trillion tax cut for the top 1 percent in

our country while focusing 66 percent of their cuts on shredding our Nation's critical safety net for our children, our seniors, our disabled, and the poor. This budget would also cost 2 million jobs, and it would slash nutrition and food assistance programs for 8 million to 9 million people.

Mr. Chairman, block-granting Medicaid, turning Medicare into a voucher program, and gutting food assistance to our children and our seniors will not reduce poverty; it will make it much, much worse. Our Democratic budget will close special interest tax loopholes in order to raise the critical revenues that we need to invest in the American people.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlelady another 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me just conclude by saying that fully supporting our safety net programs, like Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and Social Security, will reduce poverty, grow the middle class, and renew economic prosperity for all Americans.

Unlike Republicans, Democrats simply do not believe that gutting the very programs that support poor and low-income families would reduce poverty, programs such as the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit. The Van Hollen Democratic alternative budget creates 1.2 million jobs this year; it reduces the deficit by 2.4 percent; and it makes huge key investments in our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me yield myself 1 minute.

Look, I very much appreciate the gentlelady from California and where she comes from on this issue. I believe her heart is in the right place. We, too, want to make sure that we get rid of poverty. We, too, want to make sure that people get on with their lives, get on that ladder of life so that they can get out of poverty and on to good lives. That's our aim here.

Now, here is what we see. We have spent trillions of dollars on this war on poverty. We're spending \$1 trillion a year at all levels of government to fight poverty, and what have we gotten for this? We have 46 million people in poverty. The poverty rates in America are at a generational high. So rather than measure our poverty-fighting efforts by how much money we throw at programs, by inputs, why don't we start thinking about measuring it by outputs, by how many people we are helping to get out of poverty? By any measurement, this isn't working.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself another minute to say that we need to rethink our premise here. Are we simply perpetuating poverty by treating its symptoms; or shouldn't we look at what has worked in the past—what communities are doing to make a difference—and get behind those ideas?

Let's fight poverty by taking the root causes of poverty in order to break the cycle of poverty and to get people out of poverty. Those are the ideas that we are talking about here. This is not a numbers thing. This is not a budget-cutting exercise. This is taking those ideas that were so successful in reducing child poverty in the welfare reform and applying them to the other programs that have not been reformed.

Giving States more flexibility, having work requirements and job-training requirements and block grants and time limits, what did that do? All the predictions of doom and gloom were there, but we lowered child poverty. We helped get single moms back to job-training programs so they could get back to work. This is why we reform job-training programs. This is why we call for reforming our safety net—because our goal, like her goal, is to get people on with their lives so they can reach their potential.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I am honored—yea, I am thrilled—to stand and speak on this subject. It is the primary reason that I ran for Congress, and I think it is the defining issue and the most critical argument of our day.

We are at a crossroads in our history. I believe that this time is that important. What we do at this moment will determine the future of our Nation. It will determine the future of our children. It will determine the future or the death of the American Dream.

Stephen Covey, one of the great innovators and business leaders of our generation and a man who happens to be from my home State of Utah, popularized a time management concept called the "urgent-important matrix." The point of this was to help us focus on those things that are both urgent and important and to let the other things go.

Frankly, as a Congress, we do a terrible job at that. We often legislate based on the crisis of the moment, lurching from one manmade crisis to another, and the budget is a great example of that. For years, we have treated this as if it is neither urgent nor important, as if it could go on forever; but we know that that's not true.

We also know now what this President believes. He doesn't think it's important to balance our books. He doesn't think it's important to cut our debt. He has no intention of cutting any spending. Not only does he not intend to balance our budget, but he derides and dismisses those of us who think that it's important to our future; but Americans understand this, and it's not that hard.

Please listen to me on this because this is so important: a Nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the security of its citizens. A Nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the poor and the needy among them.

I speak now primarily to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: if

you care about the poor—and I know that you do. By the way, I do as well—then care enough to help them in the long run, not just for the next few years. There is nothing compassionate about letting Medicaid or Medicare go into bankruptcy. There is nothing compassionate about letting Social Security fail, but that's what's going to happen if we don't have the courage to fix this thing. We have to fix it now. This is both important and urgent.

Many of us had hoped that the President would lead on this matter, but he has chosen not to. It's not in his nature; he is much more comfortable leading from behind. Since he won't lead, those of us in Congress will.

I admire Chairman RYAN. I thank him for his courage in tackling a challenge that has terrified Congress for years—reforming entitlements in a way that will save them for our children.

We have a window within which we can make a difference. We can save America. We can save the American Dream. Please, let us have the courage to do that. That is why I support Chairman RYAN's budget and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The President has been crystal clear. His top priority is to grow the economy, to put more Americans back to work, to strengthen the middle class, to have rising middle class wages and upward mobility in this country. By attacking the jobs deficit, we can also bring down the budget deficit because we know from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that more than half of our deficit this year is due to the fact that you still have a lot of people out of work who are looking for work, which is why it's so counterproductive to adopt the approach that our Republican colleagues do.

By not replacing the sequester, the Congressional Budget Office tells us we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs just by the end of this calendar year, and those jobs are the most important things to be available to help strengthen the middle class and lift people out of poverty. But in lifting people out of poverty, it's also important to provide a little bit of support that they can stand on as they climb that ladder of opportunity. Unfortunately, this budget cuts into a lot of those legs on that stool of support, and nobody understands this issue better than our colleague.

So she may respond, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

□ 1900

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just say that I appreciate the chairman, Mr. RYAN, saying that he knows my heart is in the right place. But I also want him to know that the facts speak for themselves.

We have this chart right here, and it demonstrates very clearly that 18 mil-

lion more people would be living in poverty had it not been for those initiatives in this budget that you completely cut out: SNAP, the refundable tax credits, and the broad selection of other programs. Eighteen million more people would be in poverty.

Also let me just say that a budget is a moral document. They reflect the values of who we are as Americans.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Why would we want to impose 66 percent of the cuts in your budget on low-income individuals and the poor? That does not make any sense. That is just morally wrong.

Finally, I just have to say that the ranks of the poor began to grow under the Bush administration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. In 2005, I formed the Out of Poverty Caucus because I saw the Bush economic policies and what, in fact, they were beginning to do. We had probably 42 or 43 Members who joined that caucus. And so I just have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this didn't just begin. The ranks of the poor began to grow as a direct result of the economic policies that this budget wants to return to.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, Federal spending rises each and every year by 3.4 percent under this budget instead of 5 percent.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your efforts to lead us to a Path to Prosperity. When I'm home in Missouri in the Fourth District, I hear people say things like:

I have to balance my budget, how come Washington doesn't?

And: It's time for our government to live within its means.

And they might say: At home, we're having to tighten our belts; Washington should, too.

Well, I have good news: I agree, and this budget reflects those concerns and those priorities.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I'm proud to support a responsible budget that promotes economic growth while reducing wasteful spending. Currently, the Federal Government borrows 36 cents out of every dollar that it spends, and that puts us at an astonishing \$16 trillion in debt. This creates anxiety and uncertainty at a time when unemployment is at 8 percent and a lot of families are hurting. We must end the government's reckless borrow, tax, and spend policies. Our budget balances in 10 years, and we do it without ever increasing taxes.

Senate Democrats released a budget that actually increases taxes by \$1 tril-

lion, and never, ever balances. This is worst than the status quo. Washington must stop spending money it doesn't have. We must target the real problem this country faces, and that's uncontrollable spending. Instead of continuously taxing hardworking Americans more, we must pursue meaningful reforms and pro-growth initiatives. Our budget does that.

The keys to this budget are growth initiatives to create jobs and proactive steps to preserve and protect Medicare and Medicaid for the future. Colleagues across the aisle like to claim that this is a voucher system, which is false. The Path to Prosperity reforms Medicare for future beneficiaries by offering them the same kind of health care as current Federal workers and Members of Congress. Future seniors are provided guaranteed issue health coverage where no one will be denied coverage based on health status or preexisting conditions. They will be able to choose from a wide range of options, one of which will include traditional Medicare, if they choose to do that. The government will pay all or part of their premium.

Our updated Medicare plan would also give substantial help to the poor, who would qualify for greater premium relief than the wealthy. This will save the program from bankruptcy while fulfilling our commitment to health care security for seniors. The Democrat plan is to kick the can down the road and jeopardize this important program for our seniors. Our plan is right for senior citizens, and it's right for our future.

Additionally, we take steps to preserve Medicaid, and we send it back to the States in the form of a block grant to allow local and State control over this very important program to provide flexibility to help low-income individuals, rather than forcing States to fit into one-size-fits-all programs. It's important that we get people back to work, and our budget does that as well by consolidating and enhancing job-training programs and endorsing pro-growth tax reform.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HARTZLER. But one of the best parts is it gets our priorities right, and it provides for the common defense. There are only a few things that we should be doing here, and it provides that. It replaces and repeals the President's sequester and makes sure that our men and women in uniform have what they need.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this bill that gets our economy growing, has our priorities right, protects and preserves those programs for our seniors, and provides for the common defense.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let's be very clear. If you give States one-third of the amount of money that

they are currently getting from Medicaid and ask them to do the same job, which is what this budget would do just 10 years from now, and increasingly down that path, you will, as the non-partisan, independent Congressional Budget Office said “reduce access to care.” That’s the bottom line.

With respect to the voucher program, premium support, again, I don’t really care what label you attach to it; the impact is the same. If you want to achieve the out-year budget savings that our colleagues claim to achieve, you’ve got to put a cap on that amount, which is what their plan would do and which makes it entirely different than the plan we have for Members of Congress and Federal employees, and the plan that most people in the private sector have as well.

As this red line shows, the amount of support you would get would drop dramatically relative to rising health care costs, and that’s why we don’t call it premium support because it doesn’t provide support.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I certainly thank the Budget Committee for the work that they have done.

I’d make the argument that clearly we have a dilemma in focus and commitment and direction. I call the other budget the budget that has a sense of lacking of what people truly need. The Democratic budget is a budget that speaks to what people need, and it cares about people. It also cares about family economic security. Under the budget that Mr. RYAN is offering, the Republican budget, 3 million Texas seniors will see Medicare end as they know it, 50 million seniors across America.

But frankly, this is the real key on how the GOP budget really works: \$500 billion in their so-called balancing is taken from the Affordable Care Act in the fiscal cliff deal. That’s how they say they reached budget, so that means they’ll undermine millions of Americans who will not have health care. That’s the budget that does not concern itself with family economic security.

Then if we want to look again at the idea of safety net programs, rather than giving Americans an opportunity to stand on their own feet, the Republican budget literally cuts the programs that help reduce poverty. So it is not one that cares about economic security for our families.

Then, Mr. Chairman, if you want to really see what works, it really works when we talk to the top 2 percent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When you look at the tax rate under President Clinton, that was 39.6 percent, and we created 20.8 million jobs. The Republican

budget is a jobs killer. Then you have where we had a 35 percent tax rate, and you lost 580,000 jobs under George Bush. Here’s the Democratic budget, the Van Hollen budget. We focus on creating jobs. We replace the sequester, 750,000 jobs, reduce the jobs deficit by 450,000, and our total net is 1.2 million net jobs. Family economic security is the Van Hollen budget. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his continued leadership on the issue of the fiscal outlook for our country, on the issue of the moral obligation that we have to our children. And next, to address the growing mountain of debt that unfortunately they’re facing.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that this debate that we’re having is a debate of contrasts. When you look at the two budgets, in this Chamber and you look at the budget that is underway across the Capitol, ours is a budget that balances.

□ 1910

Just as people at home around their kitchen table at the end of the month have to do with their checkbook every month, we believe the same is true. We balance this budget within 10 years.

The other side calls for more taxes. The other budget that is being discussed in the other body, in fact, creates \$1 trillion of new taxes.

And the question for the American people really is which budget do you think grows the economy, which budget do you think helps folks gain some certainty, helps folks get back to work, helps folks who are relying on some of the programs that this body knows, because its budget office is telling us are going to go away unless we act? It is clear, the choice is clear, and the contrast couldn’t be clearer.

I would like to respond, Mr. Chairman, to some of the suggestions by Members on the other side of the aisle that somehow our budget doesn’t address the needs of those who are most in need. In fact, the opposite is the truth. Our budget protects the social safety net programs. The other budget on the other side of the aisle does nothing to respond to the alarms that have been issued by our budget counters and CBO and others year in and year out. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—all are on life support if we don’t act.

Our budget, and the chairman of our Budget Committee, has been a champion to say, let’s be responsible, let’s help those who are in need, let’s preserve the social safety net, the programs that make America who she is. It is our budget that helps those in need, Mr. Chairman, not the other side of the aisle.

Let’s look at the question of tax reform. The people of this country have

spoken out on this issue. They want a fairer and simpler Code. What Chairman RYAN has done in this budget is provided a prescription for doing just that: a broadening of the base, a lowering of the rates, and, yes, Mr. Chairman, an insurance in our budget that we are going to get rid of the special interest loopholes that have put Washington in the business of choosing favorites.

I think all of our constituents know that is not what they elect us to do. They want to see an even playing field for all. They want everyone—everyone—in this country to have a fair shot.

If you compare tax reform in the position that we take in our budget to that which the other side is proposing in this body and in the one across the Capitol, I think it is very clear: higher taxes without the reforms necessary versus what we are trying to do, which is even the playing field, giving everybody a fair shot to go and earn success.

The choice is very clear, Mr. Chairman, that our budget provides some certainty for the future for the moms and dads out there who are desperate to know that we are doing our job in Washington on their behalf; that we are going to address this fiscal situation so that they can get on about their lives; so that they can see their kids have a better education; so that they can access the health care that they have come to know, and for those who don’t have the health care, can actually have a system that will lower costs and provide real prospects for quality health care, not the kind of health care designed by this Affordable Care Act that we are going to see come into effect.

So, again, I want to thank Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for his dogged attention to this very, very alarming question of how we are going to grow our economy and doing it in a way that is thoughtful, that is well put, and has the specifics to go and do the job.

Mr. Chairman, that is something that we have not seen from the other side. We have certainly not seen that from the White House. They haven’t even presented the budget yet. And that is unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support the budget coming out of our Budget Committee under the leadership of Chairman RYAN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say a word about the health care provided in the Affordable Care Act. That means that you can stay on your parents’ policy until you are 26, so if you have a terrible accident the family is not bankrupted. That means that if you have preexisting conditions, you are not denied coverage by the insurance companies.

We keep hearing, “repeal all those benefits and some day we will get around replacing them.” We have heard that for 3 years. There is nothing in this budget about replacing.

I think the majority leader asked the right question: Which budget grows the economy? And I would just like to read from what the majority leader said on the floor of this House last year about the sequester. Here is what Mr. CANTOR said:

Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made.

Then he cites a study showing that 200,000 Virginian jobs are on the line.

Well, guess what? The Republican plan leaves in place the deep sequester cuts. That is why by the end of this year we will see 750,000 fewer jobs, including a lot fewer jobs in Virginia, as Mr. CANTOR acknowledged.

Why in the world we would want to do that when we have people struggling to find work, I don't know. Because in the Democratic budget, we replace the sequester so that we save those jobs. In fact, we invest more in jobs going forward.

On the tax issue—here is a headline from the other day in *The Washington Post*—a nonpartisan group did a study: “GOP Tax Cuts Would Benefit Very Wealthy.” And that is the bottom line. Tax breaks for the folks at the very top—all those loopholes we talked about closing—not one loophole closure to help reduce the deficit in a balanced way.

I would now like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, who has been working on these issues and working for working families, Mr. COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I appreciate the time.

The thing that disturbs me the most about this budget is its inability to understand what our priorities should be.

The Republican budget keeps the defense budget at \$550 billion. There is no question we need a Defense Department, but I don't think the other side understands what the real enemy is. The enemy to my constituents and each of us is not lurking overseas. It is disease. And to each American who will suffer from or has a family member suffering from Alzheimer's or AIDS or cancer or heart disease, diabetes, Parkinson's, post-polio, or whatever, they want cures and treatments.

The National Institutes of Health are cut in this budget by at least \$1.6 billion. It is a \$30 billion budget. The Defense Department is \$550 billion.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, our enemy is disease. The department of defense for the human being and the human body is the National Institutes of Health. It is someplace the two parties should be able to come together and agree that we need to fund research, which creates jobs and finds cures and treatments.

The other side talks about what this is going to do to children and grandchildren. I have heard people talk about their children and grandchildren and what their mothers would want. Their mothers want their children to

live long lives and not to suffer from cancer and to get cures and to get treatments.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. The cures and the treatments are going to benefit the next generation and the generation after that more than this generation. This is a place where spending dollars creates jobs, saves lives, and benefits future generations. Most research that has been done in this country that has come up with cures and treatments has been funded by the government or at least helped by the government, and that continues to this day.

People say we should be different than Cyprus and Greece and Spain and Portugal; and we are, because we funded those researches and we have come up with the cures and the treatments. That is why this is the greatest country on the face of the Earth. We need to see that the National Institutes of Health are funded at a greater level and not diminished.

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind the Committee that the gentleman from Wisconsin has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Maryland has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would just note for the record that funding on discretionary levels like that are set by the Appropriations Committee, not the Budget Committee, so those levels will be set later by the Appropriations Committee.

I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

□ 1920

Mr. PERRY. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I deeply care about my mother, who's on Social Security and Medicare, and my two little girls, who are counting on their daddy to make sure that those programs are available when the time comes, and, of course, for the constituents that are counting on me to make sure that those programs are available for them. So I commend Chairman RYAN on his leadership in drafting a budget that responsibly addresses our national debt and ensures that my own children and all the residents of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania are not burdened with Washington's spending problem any longer.

This legislation balances our budget in 10 years. I know some folks are saying, Why 10 years? And I say, Why not ever in your budgets? Why not ever? It reduces spending and makes responsible reforms to mandatory spending programs.

For the past few weeks, I've heard from hundreds of constituents, including my very own mother, about how this budget will change Social Security for current beneficiaries, and I want to make clear that the Ryan budget does not do that. It does not cut Social Se-

curity. But I will remind everybody that the Social Security Disability Insurance fund will be insolvent by 2016. That's 3 years from now. So if you're 21 years old, when you're 24, it's insolvent. If you're 45 years old, when you're 48, it's insolvent.

The Medicare part A trust fund will be exhausted by 2024. This is not a long time away for young people or old people. I had to remind my mom that, if these programs were not reformed, there would be nothing left for her grandchildren, there would be nothing left for her son, and very likely there will be nothing left for her. This legislation makes those reforms responsible by allowing Medicare recipients the opportunity to choose options specific to their needs, and it repeals the President's plan to have a group of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to slash Medicare benefits for seniors, including my mom.

It also repeals the President's health care law, which has placed an undue burden on our job creators and their families. Penn Waste, a company in the district I represent, has told me that ObamaCare health care costs, the Affordable Health Care law, will cost their employees a minimum of \$68 a week more right now. That's a meal out with your family. That's an extra tank of gas in your car.

This budget also ensures our servicemen and -women are protected by providing \$560 billion for defense spending in fiscal year 2014, an amount consistent with America's military goals and strategies.

This budget is responsible. The Senate budget, the Democrat budget, each one starts at no less than a trillion dollars in new spending. I urge everybody to support the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to a terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for his leadership.

We are at a fork in the road and there are two stark choices. The Democratic plan promotes progress for the many; the Republican plan promotes prosperity for the few. The Democratic plan will put Americans back to work; the Republican plan will put Americans out of work. The Democratic plan takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction; the Republican plan will balance the budget on the backs of children and working families and seniors and the sick and the afflicted.

Whenever we make that observation, our friends on the other side say that we are trying to scare the American people by communicating misinformation. It's a very cute observation, but it has no factual basis. Let's just check the record.

The Republican plan cuts higher education spending by \$168 billion. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan embraces \$85 billion in random sequestration cuts

that will cost the economy 750,000 jobs. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan will cut spending on Medicaid by \$810 billion—a program, by the way, that disproportionately benefits poor children, seniors, and the disabled. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan will turn Medicare into a voucher program, but because that voucher will not keep up with the cost of health care inflation, it will deny beneficiaries what they are receiving today. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

And that is why the Republican plan is designed to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable in our society, and it should be rejected. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the chairman for the hard work that he and the House Budget Committee have done on this incredible effort for a new plan to balance the budget in 10 years.

This proposal invites our friends across the aisle, President Obama, and the Senate to commit to the same commonsense goal. The 2014 House Republican budget sets a responsible precedent by ensuring our government lives within its means, just like millions of Americans across this country and just like my constituents back in North Carolina. I hear from them every day and they ask me: Why can't the Federal budget be balanced? Why can't Washington get its spending under control?

This proposal sets real, practical goals that will stop spending money we don't have, fix our broken Tax Code, protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, reforms welfare programs like Medicaid so that it can deliver on the promises to deliver to those who are in most need. It also does repeal the President's health care plan and allows us to put in place real, sensible, patient-centered reforms for health care.

The House Republican budget reduces the deficit by \$4.6 trillion over the next 10 years. This budget offers a plan to expand opportunity and creates jobs. While not sufficient by themselves, policy reforms at the Federal level can help foster an environment that promotes economic growth. This budget seeks to equip Americans with the skills to succeed in the 21st century economy and grow that economy.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and I believe the American people are looking for this leadership here in Washington, because they know that bureaucrats here in Washington do not know what they know back home.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a new Member of Congress, who is on the Veterans' Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

I rise to address the so-called Path to Prosperity that this body is now debating.

I'm struck by the beltway media bubble that calls this plan bold and its creator, Mr. RYAN, a serious policymaker who isn't afraid to make the tough decisions. My Republican colleagues call this proposal brave and necessary, but I could not disagree more. I don't believe it's brave to break the promises we made to our seniors. I think it's dangerous. I don't believe it's necessary to cut funding for police, firefighters, and programs for low-income citizens. I think that's foolish. I don't believe that it's wise to provide tax credits for private jets and luxury yachts.

My colleague, Mr. RYAN, seems to be living in an alternate reality. He thinks that we can fund the Federal Government at 19 percent of GDP with an aging population whose health care costs are at 18 percent of GDP. Even conservative idol President Reagan funded the Federal Government at 22 percent of GDP when there was no retiring baby boom generation and health care costs only amounted to 1 percent of GDP. Would Mr. RYAN accuse President Reagan's administration of “wild government spending?” I don't think so.

The GOP budget boils down to three steps: phase one, cut spending; phase two, I'm not sure what their plans are; phase three, prosperity.

There's a gaping hole in Mr. RYAN's logic. His thinking is incomplete. How is cutting funding for infrastructure, education, and health care a Path to Prosperity?

Mr. Chairman, a century of evidence shows that austerity will not lead to prosperity. Democrats offer alternative proposals that deal with the real crisis in America—the jobs crisis.

□ 1930

A plan to reach full employment is the true path to prosperity. I urge a “no” vote on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget proposal.

Before I came to Washington, D.C., I was the Appropriations Committee chairman of the Kansas State Legislature, where we were required each year to balance our State's budget. We were like a lot of Kansas families; we couldn't spend more money than we bring in—quite a novel concept.

As a Member of Congress, I have stood in disbelief, much like most Americans, at the wanton disregard for balancing the Federal budget. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is astonishing. In the last 50 years, we've only balanced the budget six times. That's why I'm so happy that we finally have a budget be-

fore us that balances. Not only does it balance, it pays off the national debt down to zero.

Now, I support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to require Congress to do its job and make sure that we don't spend more than we take in. Opponents of that amendment often say we don't need the Constitution to require us to do our work, to balance the budget. We have all the tools to balance the budget now. Great. This is our opportunity to prove it. Let's come together and do our jobs.

Americans are sick and tired of the standard lame Washington excuses of why we couldn't do our jobs and balance the budget. How can you keep going home and blaming others, blaming the other side for the fiscal state of our Nation?

The facts are, Mr. Chairman, besides the RSC budget, this is the only budget being presented that balances and pays the debt down to zero. So we are hearing speech after speech today that criticizes this balanced budget without offering a balanced alternative.

Mr. Chairman, each day, hard-working Americans get up to do their jobs. They work long, hard hours. They put food on the table. They raise their families, and they pay lots of taxes. Is it too much for them to ask for us to balance our books, to spend their tax dollars wisely?

Let's chart a debt-free future for this country. Let's rebuild our economy. Let's honor the work and commitment of the American taxpayers, and let's stand together for a balanced budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We've had a good and healthy debate today. I want to go back to the question that was posed by the Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR: Which of these budgets does more to help the economy? Which budget helps put more people back to work?

Well, we know that the austerity approach taken in the Republican budget will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working by the end of this year and 2 million fewer Americans working next year, compared to the alternative that the Democrats are proposing, which would replace the sequester. So you achieve the same amount of deficit reduction, but you don't do it in a way that results in slowing down economic growth in this country this year, next year, or the year beyond. We tackle the budget deficit by dealing with the jobs deficit right now and then taking a balanced approach into the future.

Let's talk about taxes. The Republican budget will give another windfall tax break to the very wealthiest people in this country. In order to make up

the revenue lost, they will inevitably have to increase the tax burden on middle-income taxpayers unless they're going to put their budget out of balance. Now, just to safeguard against that, we offered an amendment that said, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income families. Every Republican on the Budget Committee voted against that.

We can address our priorities and reduce the deficit in a smart, consistent way without violating our commitments to seniors, without reopening the prescription drug doughnut hole so people with high drug costs will have to shell out lots more—thousands over the period of this budget. We can do it without making the interest rate on student loans double this July. We can do it without cutting our investment in transportation by 15 percent when we have all these unmet needs and 15 percent employment in the construction industry. We know we can do all those things and reduce our deficit the smart way because we do it in the House Democratic budget, which dramatically drops the deficit so that it's growing much slower than the economy, stabilizes the debt at 70 percent of GDP, and, yes, balances the budget the same time the Republican budget last year balanced. What a conversion to hit this political target this year after all the talk last year. And the reason—and the fundamental difference here—is that, by trying to drive to that political target, they end up balancing the budget on the backs of everybody else—commitments to seniors, investment in our economy, investment in the future.

At the end of the day—and we showed the numbers earlier, Mr. Chairman. They can't have it both ways. They can't say their budget balances in 10 years and at the same time they repeal ObamaCare, because the \$715 million in savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare, is embedded right in their budget.

The trillion dollars in revenue from that they say they're going to pull out of the air. But if we repealed ObamaCare today, it would be out of balance by over \$500 billion. So let's focus on the task at hand, put people back to work. Let's have a Tax Code that makes sense for the middle class. And let's keep our commitment to seniors and grow this economy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that people reject the lopsided Republican plan and adopt the balanced approach presented by the Democratic Caucus.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also want to thank my friend from Maryland for a lively debate. He and I have done this so much we can probably finish each other's sentences.

Washington is arrogant. There is an arrogance here in the Federal Govern-

ment. It's an arrogance that says we know how to run things better in Washington; we should run everything here. We reject that.

We believe in the principle of federalism, which is contained in our Constitution. We think that people who are closer to the problems can probably do a better job of fixing problems.

I have a letter from the Governor of Utah, a letter from the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Iowa:

This budget will replace the rigid, one-size-fits-all Federal programs and instead offers the States the flexibility they need to make these programs work for the people they serve.

This budget gives States maximum flexibility in areas like Medicaid, food stamps, TANF so States can determine the optimal way to provide services to these unique populations.

We want to empower people closer to the problem to help solve these problems because you know what? We're not fixing these problems.

The other measure of arrogance in Washington is only in Washington is reducing the increase of spending a huge cut. Only in Washington is growing spending for the Federal Government at 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year a massive cut. You know what? Government's growing just fine. The Senate Democrat budget says let's grow spending at 4.7 percent a year instead of 5. That's supposed to be progress.

The family budget is growing at less than 2.5 percent for the next 10 years. That's the best projection we've got, the most generous one. If the family budget is only growing 2.5 percent and the Federal Government is growing about 5 percent, this is imbalance. This is arrogance. We should ask our Federal Government to do just what our families do and balance the budget. That's the responsible thing to do.

Now, let's take a look at what our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing. The one consistent theme of all of these budgets that are being offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, by the other Democrats, by the Senate Democrats is tax more and spend more.

The Senate Democrat budget, that comes in the cheapest one of them all. Increase net spending—remember, we have a trillion-dollar deficit, a debt crisis in the future. What do they say? Let's net increase spending above where we are and let's raise taxes \$923 billion.

The House Democratic budget, let's have a net spending increase of \$476 billion and let's raise taxes \$1.2 trillion.

□ 1940

The Congressional Black Caucus budget: let's raise spending \$1.99 trillion and have a tax increase of \$2.9 trillion. Or the Progressive Caucus budget—that one really takes the cake—let's have a \$4.65 trillion spending increase only to be slightly outdone by a \$5.683 trillion tax increase.

This is what they're saying: ignore the deficit, ignore the economy, all the

answers lie in Washington, take more from hardworking small businesses, take more from families, spend it in Washington, and, oh, by the way, we don't have a crisis. That's just scare-mongering.

Do you know what? Try telling that to our children and our grandchildren who are guaranteed to get a lower standard of living if we don't fix this mess. Try telling that to the struggling workers, the families, the people in poverty in America today who aren't cutting it in this economy.

Balancing the budget helps us promote a healthier economy to create jobs and get people back on their feet again, and that's exactly why we're proposing and passing this budget.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. All time has expired.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

During the annual debate on the budget resolution, the House assigns 1 hour to the Joint Economic Committee to assess current economic conditions and evaluate how the budget resolution, if implemented, would improve the outlook for America's economy. As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee during the 113th Congress, I'm pleased to lead this discussion.

For more than 2 years, the Joint Economic Committee has demonstrated that the current recovery we're in is the weakest of all recoveries lasting at least 1 year since World War II in terms of economic growth, in terms of jobs, and in personal income for families.

Let's examine the following three charts. In each, the red lines depict the current recovery where we're headed right now; the navy blue lines depict the average of all the other recoveries since World War II, and the sky-blue line depicts the average of these recoveries.

Since the recession ended 3½ years ago, our real economy, the real GDP, has grown by a mere 7.5 percent. That's this one. But during the comparable period, real economic growth averaged more than double that, 17.5 percent in other postwar recoveries. It is a huge gap between where we are today as a Nation and just the average, C-student, middle-of-the-road recovery of the past. We are lagging far behind. There is a serious growth gap.

President Obama often boasts that his recovery has generated 6.4 million jobs in the private sector since we hit a low in February 2010. But if you look at previous postwar recoveries, just apples to apples, the average increase in private jobs over the comparable time would have generated an equivalent of 10.4 million jobs. This is the comparison. These are the jobs of the current

recovery. This is just the average. And that blue-shaded area is the range between the very worst, the one we're in, and the very best, which is a lot more jobs. In fact, today, this recovery compared to the average, we're missing 4 million jobs in America. We're missing more than \$1 trillion out of our economy because of the current recovery in this growth gap.

In fact, if this recovery had been merely average, middle-of-the-road, instead of having fewer jobs on Main Street than when the recession began, which is where we're at right now, fewer jobs on Main Street, private payroll employment would have been at an all-time high if this would have just been an average recovery.

Sluggish economic growth and job creation have also slowed personal income growth, the money that you earn as a family. In recoveries since 1960, disposable income, real disposable income, apples to apples, per person, grew by \$3,500 over 43 months. But during the same period, this is where the average income for families has grown; but look where we are under the current recovery. During the same period, for the current recovery, personal income growth for a family, it isn't \$3,500, it's about \$416. So this current recovery is taking a real toll on families and taking a real toll on our economy and on jobs.

Now, think what is more worrisome than this economy's weak performance is the ability of our economy to grow and create private-sector jobs in the future. Economic evidence shows that it may have permanently fallen. In the most recent "Budget and Economic Outlook," the Congressional Budget Office lowered its estimate for our long-term growth rate as a Nation, the potential GDP, from its average since 1950 of 3.3 percent. They lowered it and our future to 2.3 percent.

Now, one percentage point may not sound like much, but it has a huge effect on our economy, on our jobs, and on the ability of the Federal Government to pay its bills.

Think about it like this: at America's traditional 3.3 percent growth rate of the past half a century, our real economy doubles every 22 years. But at this new normal, this new slower rate of 2.3 percent, it takes almost 32 years to double in size. That's a decade longer; that's a decade slower.

A permanent growth gap of 1 percent translates into one-third slower growth for our young people seeking to find their first job and for families hoping to reach their American Dream. A permanent growth gap of 1 percent means our economy will be \$20 trillion smaller in 2052. That's actually a growth gap for 1 year larger than the entire American economy today.

It also means it will be harder to balance the Federal budget since a permanent growth gap of 1 percent means the loss of a whopping \$93 trillion from our Federal coffers, again, over the next four decades. Think about \$93 trillion

today. The unfunded liability for Social Security, Medicare, and our Federal pensions in today's dollars is only \$87 billion. So the prospect of a "new normal" for America's economy in which our future growth permanently slows by one-third should be a red flag for all Americans.

We are told in school growing up that in Shakespeare's play, a soothsayer told Julius Caesar to beware the ides of March, the 15th. Ironically, this year, President Obama released his "Economic Report of the President" on that ominous date, and buried in this report are some startling admissions and some dire warnings for the American people. Unlike Caesar, this Congress should take heed.

First, the President's report acknowledges that the current recovery is indeed the weakest since World War II, as Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee have been saying now for more than 2 years. This growth gap is real, and it's widening. Second, our economy's ability to grow in the future, the growth rate of potential GDP, has decreased. The President admits that.

□ 1950

Unfortunately, President Obama then seeks to blame this new normal on everything other than his economic leadership. The report attributes two-thirds of the decrease to demographic factors, specifically an aging population and a slower rate of net immigration. The report attributes the remaining one-third to just about everything that's ever occurred in the last 5 years.

Demographic factors account for some of the new normal. But if you think about it, our potential economy for the future, it's a function of how many hours that are worked in America and the growth of the workers, how productive they are. In turn, what drives that productivity of the American worker is if businesses invest in new business, new equipment, new buildings, new software. That drives jobs along Main Street.

The policies of the Obama White House—higher taxes; the unwillingness to propose real solutions to save Social Security and Medicare for future generations; the prospects of higher costs and regulations due to the President's new ObamaCare law; how we regulate our local banks; global warming regulations; and suppression of energy production on Federal lands and waters, America's lands and waters—have generated so much uncertainty, and it's really squelched new business investment in America. Unlike real personal consumption, nonresidential investment from the business community still remains below what it was before the recession began.

Mr. Chairman, this new normal for America, the growth gap that we're in today, the prospect that America will grow slower in the future is unacceptable. Republican Members of this

House are working to accelerate growth. A big step we can take forward tonight is to pass the House budget. It is a responsible, balanced budget.

By estimations, it will raise our economic growth by 1 percent in the next year. That's significant. It will add \$1,500 in new purchasing power for households. And if you look over the long term, the next 10 years, the House budget could well add up to 3 percent to our economic growth and \$4,000 per household in real income people don't have today, real gains that they don't have today.

The truth of the matter is the roadblocks to America's future are still in place: the prospect of higher taxes; the failure to reform and save our entitlements; ObamaCare with all the new taxes, new regulations; higher costs for families; and the fact that we're not pursuing tax reform, at least from this White House, with the Ways and Means Committee and House Republicans in this budget to move toward a fairer, simpler tax code that closes tax loopholes and does it not to fuel spending but rather to fuel lower rates for families and small businesses and make us competitive again as a Nation.

This budget resolution, this responsible and balanced budget developed by the Budget Committee chaired by PAUL RYAN, is the first step toward a brighter economic future for our children and grandchildren.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume as I'm pleased to represent the Democratic point of view in this budget.

We now have before this Congress the choice of two profoundly different paths forward for the American economy. One based on severe austerity for the many and deep cuts in programs for the vulnerable that is offered by Chairman RYAN and our friends from across the aisle. No new revenues are included in Mr. RYAN's plan.

The other proposal, offered by the Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and the Democrats, is based on a balance of targeted spending cuts, the closing of loopholes and the elimination of costly tax expenditures that benefit the very few. It uses a balance of spending cuts and new revenue.

This is perhaps the most important choice that Congress will make this year. It will determine what kind of country we're going to be, what kind of economy our children will inherit and what kind of place we will make for ourselves in the world.

But before we examine our differences, let's look at the things we can all agree on: the long-term structural deficit needs to be addressed. On that there is no question; there is agreement. We need to spur economic growth, which is vital. Without it, there's no hope. More jobs and opportunities need to be created. The recovery

is leaving too many people behind. And wasteful spending needs to be eliminated and costs need to be controlled. On these things we can all agree. All these things need doing. This is not our argument.

Our disagreement is over how to do it and how long it should take. It's also helpful to remember how we got here and how far we've come under progress under the Obama administration.

As you can see from this chart—and I call it the “V chart”—from December of 2007 through December of 2009, the economy lost a staggering 8.7 million jobs. That red section represents what was going on at the end of the Bush administration. The blue section shows what happened when President Obama took office. You can see there was quite a turnaround. Instead of going down, we started going up and gaining jobs. In fact, there have been 36 months of private jobs gained in 36 months.

During this last 3-year period here, the private sector has added nearly 6.4 million jobs. Just last month, the private sector added 246,000 jobs. So we've been moving in the right direction, from the deep red valley into the hope of moving forward, and that is where we are now.

The unemployment rate is down almost 2.5 percentage points from its peak in October of 2009. Our economy came very close to falling into the abyss, but since the depths of the Great Recession, as you can see from this chart, we are making progress.

As you can see from the next chart, the economy has recorded 14 consecutive quarters of GDP growth. Again, we are moving in the right direction. Key sectors such as manufacturing and construction have rebounded. In 2012, the Case-Shiller Home Price Indices rose by 7.3 percent. A recovery is clearly underway. But where do we go from here, and how do we speed things up?

Let's look first at the proposal from Representative RYAN and the Republicans. From what I see, there are only three things wrong with it: its priorities, its math, and its vision for America. The Ryan budget is based solely on massive cuts to domestic investments; cuts to programs that service and benefit the working millions and help the most vulnerable; and cuts in tax rates to benefit the fortunate few.

For many who are struggling now, the Ryan plan would lead to a slow economic death, death from a thousand cuts. It is absolutely impossible to cut your way to prosperity. The Ryan plan would make deep and painful cuts to vital domestic programs. It would change the food stamp program—a program that helps millions—into a block grant and cut its funding by \$135 billion.

Medicare, as we know it, would come to an end. The Ryan plan includes a voucher system that would increase out-of-pocket health care costs by over \$5,000 per senior. Here's what the AARP had to say about the Ryan budget and Medicare:

Chairman Paul Ryan's proposed budget fails to address the high cost of health care and instead shifts costs onto seniors and future retirees. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work is not the answer.

□ 2000

Cuts to Medicaid could affect as many as 60 million people annually. Half of these are children; and of the adults on Medicaid, more than two-thirds are women.

The Ryan plan repeals the Affordable Care Act, which would sharply cut the overall level of health care available to tens of millions. Yet, to make his budget balance, RYAN counts the \$716 billion in Medicare savings from the Affordable Care Act. It's a hoax of epic proportions. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would return us to a time when insurance companies could charge women more—it's called “gender rating”—just for being women. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would also eliminate the ban on discrimination against those with preexisting conditions, the ability to remain on parents' health plans until age 26, and the expansion of Medicaid. Then, while tens of millions of Americans would be struggling under the harsh new austerity measures, the Ryan plan would cut the tax bills for the most fortunate.

Last year, the Joint Economic Committee estimated that RYAN's tax plan would lower taxes for millionaires by about \$300,000 while raising taxes for individual taxpayers earning between \$50,000 and \$100,000 by over \$4,000. How fair is that?

At a time when income inequality is widely viewed as a very serious problem in our country, the Ryan plan would make it worse. The gap between the haves and the have-nots would grow larger under the Ryan plan. The Ryan plan would ask tens of millions to bear additional burdens—pay additional taxes—and face additional hardships while it cut taxes for the fortunate few and preserved loopholes for Big Oil and spent an additional half-trillion dollars on the military over the next 10 years.

Then, at the end of a decade of painful cuts, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Ryan budget would have managed to actually add \$5.7 trillion to the deficit. A close look at the math makes it clear that the Ryan budget can't recoup the revenue lost from its tax cuts without imposing large tax increases on middle class families. The Tax Policy Center was unwilling to speculate on where the lost revenue would come from. In addition, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that the Ryan budget would kill 750,000 jobs this year, 2 million next year, and would decrease the gross domestic product by 1.7 percentage points.

The priorities of this budget are all wrong. It kills jobs, stifles growth and adds to the deficit, all while making

life harder for seniors, women, children, and the most vulnerable in our society.

The math of the budget just does not add up. Simple arithmetic tells us that the only way to pay for Mr. RYAN's proposed tax cuts for the fortunate few is to eliminate many of the deductions that middle class families count on to pay for housing and health care and to save for their retirements. The Ryan tax plan would further burden those who are struggling by substantially lowering taxes for the most fortunate—and that's not spin. That's just plain math.

The vision this budget offers of America is totally at odds with who we claim to be. It's a vision of a country where the government is indifferent to the suffering of many while only paying attention to the demands of the few.

Then there is the other plan that is before us, the Democratic plan, with a balanced set of priorities—a better vision for the future found in the budget offered by House Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN. It takes a balanced approach with targeted spending and new revenues. It would cut waste, add jobs, and spur the economic growth of the economy.

It would reduce the deficit by an additional \$1.8 trillion without jeopardizing the recovery or harming the middle class. It includes \$1.2 trillion in new revenue obtained, not by tax increases, but by closing loopholes and eliminating wasteful spending that benefits the wealthiest Americans and the largest corporations. It eliminates \$4 billion in annual tax breaks to the oil and gas industry, an industry that is making profits. They don't need a tax break. In fact, they are making enormous profits.

So why does the Ryan budget give them a government subsidy? The Democratic plan invests in infrastructure, education, job training, and innovation. It is designed, first and foremost, to help create jobs and to strengthen the economy. The House Democratic budget also makes critical investments in our future.

\$200 billion is invested in infrastructure, education, job training, and innovation, helping to create jobs and strengthen the economy. These investments include \$80 billion for an education jobs initiative, \$50 billion for transportation needs, and \$10 billion for an infrastructure jobs bank. As Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said many times over the past few years, simply pursuing deep cuts in the short term will slow the rate of economic growth, bring down revenues and lead to less deficit reduction.

We have two paths before us. We can choose a path of austerity and indifference that will limit economic growth and increase inequality; or we can choose one of inspiration and inclusion that invests in our country and creates opportunities for everyone.

I choose opportunity over austerity. I urge my colleagues to reject the Ryan budget and to support the budget offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN and the House Democrats.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a key member of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I want to shed a little light on what has been discussed on the floor tonight, Mr. Chairman. We are hearing a lot of conversation about Medicare.

We have to be clear that, in ObamaCare, this was the largest health care reform bill this country had ever seen. It's going to spend \$2 trillion of deficit spending over the next 10 years. With that massive new health care reform bill, guess what? Medicare is going broke in 10 to 12 years. So with this great health care reform, they didn't have enough foresight to save our seniors' Medicare program, the program they've actually paid for over the course of their lifetimes. I think our seniors deserve better than what they've received in ObamaCare.

We hear a lot about what we've done with the \$716 billion in ObamaCare. Let's be clear between the two plans.

My friends across the aisle want to take \$716 billion of savings from Medicare—take that money out—and use it for a different set of people in ObamaCare. They want to use it for people who didn't pay for the program. On our side of the aisle, we want to take that savings and use it for our seniors—it's their money; they deserve to get it—and we use it to shore up the program. This makes sense.

You talk about facts and numbers, think back to what the President told us with regard to ObamaCare. He said, Listen, you're going to see your health care costs go down by \$2,500 a year per family of four. The truth? What happened? Health care costs went up by \$3,000 a year for a family of four. That's a \$5,500 turnaround for a family of four in his health care reform bill. Listen, that's a lot of money for hardworking American families.

Let's talk about what else has been discussed by my friends across the aisle.

□ 2010

If you recall the stimulus bill, a trillion dollars in spending, remember, we were supposed to spend a trillion dollars and get an unemployment rate by 2013 of 5.2 percent. Well, the reality is we're sitting at 7.7 percent. But if you add back in everybody who has stopped looking for work because they can't find it because this has been one of the longest and lamest recoveries since the Great Depression, it's actually up at 10 percent. Listen, these policies and these promises haven't worked for the American people.

Let's talk about taxes. We have a plan that will reform the Tax Code. It

will make it fairer, flatter, simpler, easier to use, and we root out the loopholes, take away the preferences and the exemptions. We get away from crony capitalism. A fairer code. You have a chance to vote for that kind of tax reform in our budget.

But let's compare that to what my friends across the aisle propose. Well, a trillion dollars in tax increases in ObamaCare, \$600 billion of tax increases in the fiscal cliff.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. DUFFY. And another \$1.2 trillion in this new proposal, for a total of \$2.8 trillion of new taxes. Mr. Chairman, we've seen this before. This is tax-and-spend liberalism at its finest.

I think the American people understand what has happened in this very slow recovery. This is a chart that the chairman showed earlier, but you see the growth rate and the red line of what we've seen in this recovery, and you see the average growth rate of other recoveries from other recessions. And the difference is 4 million jobs between this recovery and the average recovery. Well, that's 4 million families that don't have work, that aren't paying for food on the table and a roof over their head. These are real people and real families in places like central and northern Wisconsin that have been impacted by this economy.

As Chairman RYAN talks about, we have a choice of two futures, and my Democratic colleagues across the aisle want this massive debt and deficit to be the future for our children. We think there's a better way. We look at being responsible and paying off our debt in a way that's going to work, not just for this generation, but for future generations.

What are we doing? We owe \$17 trillion in debt. We borrow \$1 trillion every year, and there's no end in sight, and we're printing money to buy our debts. And you say keep going, keep printing, keep borrowing, keep spending. This is going to end well, you tell us, or you tell our American families. Give me an example of where printing, borrowing, and spending ends in economic growth, prosperity, wealth, or sustainable jobs.

Let's go back to fiscal responsibility. Let's live within our means in this country, pay down our debt, do what's responsible, and leave our children a brighter future.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Republican House budget merely shifts health care costs to families. It makes no attempt to bend the curve to lower health care costs, and the voucher program for Medicare will only mean that seniors will be paying more for health care, by some estimates as much as \$5,900 per person, and that's why the AARP and other independent organizations that track health care benefits for seniors are so opposed to it.

I now yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Great State of Maryland, ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Over the past 3 years, nearly 6 million new jobs have been added to the American economy, and the unemployment rate has fallen to 7.7 percent. Although this is real progress from where we were during the financial crisis inherited by President Obama, we can do far more to boost economic growth and continue to create jobs.

The American people deserve a budget that supports economic growth, responsibly reduces long-term deficits, and ensures equal opportunity for all. Chairman RYAN's recent budget does not satisfy any of these goals. Instead, it will slow economic growth, increase the unemployment rate, cut critical investments in our Nation's future, and harm our seniors, all while protecting the interests of the wealthiest Americans.

The Ryan budget would lower the top tax rate for the rich while hitting middle-class families with thousands of dollars in additional taxes every year. Nearly 30 million middle-income Americans would lose their health insurance because of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and tens of millions of the poorest would lose coverage because of Ryan's plan to gut Medicaid. We can do better.

It would destroy the commitments we've made to our Nation's seniors by turning Medicare into a voucher program. It would shift the rising costs of health care onto those very Americans who have already suffered deep financial shocks in the recent fiscal crisis. Many of them have lost their homes, lost their health insurance, lost their jobs, lost equity in their homes, lost their savings, and now the Ryan budget would break another promise to them.

In a fairly cynical move, the Ryan budget would repeal those provisions of the Affordable Care Act that would expand access to care, while keeping in place all the revenue generated by the act.

The Ryan budget also guts investments in science, education, infrastructure—all critical to job creation and economic growth, as well as to the future of our children. If you don't believe it, go talk to the doctors at NIH, the ones who worry about whether they'll be able to complete the research that they're doing. One that I talked to just a few days ago was telling me just a few years ago there were certain types of cancers that were deadly, and now because of the research at NIH, they're chronic. I don't know how you put a price tag on somebody's life.

This budget would reduce non-defense discretionary spending, including core social services that middle-class families rely on, by an additional \$700 billion over the next 10 years below the senseless cuts already required under the sequester.

And his plan, Mr. RYAN's plan, repeats past attacks on Federal employees by cutting the workforce by 10 percent over the next decade and requiring Federal workers to contribute an additional \$132 billion to their retirement plans.

To justify these proposals, the majority continues to argue that policies that support austerity, such as sequestration, will solve our fiscal problems and magically create prosperity for all. In fact, these stale theories will do nothing but harm hardworking Americans and our seniors, and that is why the American people resoundingly rejected this theory just this past November, not very long ago.

Last week, the Joint Economic Committee convened a hearing to examine constructive measures to stabilize our economy and decrease our long-term Federal debt. Testifying before our committee was Alice Rivlin, very well respected, who served as the founding Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Federal Reserve Vice Chair. She explained that discretionary spending is not a driver of future deficits and that cutting discretionary spending would not slow projected increases in future Federal spending. Instead, Ms. Rivlin expressed concern that additional cuts at this time would have a restraining effect—those were her words—on our economic recovery, threatening to trigger a new recession. We can do better than that.

□ 2020

Similarly, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Ben Bernanke has warned many times over the past few years that pursuing deep cuts in the short-term will slow the rate of economic growth, bring down revenues, and actually lead to less deficit reduction overall. I didn't say that, Chairman Bernanke said that.

Certainly, I agree that Congress must act to put our fiscal house in order, but we must do this in a balanced manner that increases economic stability and certainty in the marketplace. To ensure economic growth, these policies must include a mixture of appropriate revenue increases and targeted spending cuts.

I don't think there's one Member of Congress that disagrees that we must cut spending, but we also must address our fiscal issues in a balanced way. And when we cut, we must cut as if we were the most skilled heart surgeon performing the most delicate operation on a critical patient so that the patient does not die.

To that end, Democrats have put forward a balanced approach to cut spending responsibly, increase revenues and create jobs, like Congressman VAN HOLLEN's plan and Senator MURRAY's plan, which achieve new significant savings by eliminating tax loopholes and cutting wasteful spending.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I grant the gentleman as much time as he may consume.

Mr. CUMMINGS. At the same time, they continue critical investments in infrastructure, education, job training, innovation, all of which will help to strengthen long-term economic growth.

The fastest and most effective way to stabilize the economy and reduce deficits is to put Americans back to work. That is why we need to strengthen the fiscal policies that will support growth, rather than adopting policies that will destroy jobs.

Finally, the only path forward is for Democrats and Republicans to work together to draft a reasonable budget that offers hope and prosperity for all Americans, rather than tax cuts for the rich and crumbs to the rest.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Ryan budget so that we can craft a budget that works for all Americans.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

You know, we did have an interesting hearing in the Joint Economic Committee about the growth gap in America, about the thought and prospect that America's future growth could shrink by as much as a third, the damage it would do for families, to our economy, to our ability to pay our bills as a Nation.

And when we asked the four witnesses, all from different backgrounds and different philosophies, we asked them a simple question.

One, do you believe higher tax increases, more tax increases, would help the American economy today? Not one of them said it would.

And we asked them, what do we need to reassure our investors and put America back on a firm financial path? They all said, you need to act now on reforming Social Security and Medicare for the long haul.

And I said, so when is now? And they generally agreed by June or July. I mean, now.

The Republican budget does that. The Democrat budget ignores our problems, ignores the advice of four distinguished economists.

Earlier tonight a claim was made that some of the budgets are indifferent to the suffering of many. I want to address the suffering of many in today's America, under today's recovery.

Take a look at this. Since the bottom of the recession, the President often likes to boast that he has created over 6 million jobs along Main Street in America. But what he doesn't talk about much is that, in that same period, this Nation has forced over 8 million families on to food stamps, simply to have food on their table, simply to keep hunger from their door.

You are more likely, as a family under this recovery, to be forced to apply for food stamps than to actually walk into the door of a company that's offering you a job. That's not the sign

of a healthy recovery. That's the suffering that occurs under today's recovery that this President has led. That's the growth gap's impact on real people.

Let's take a look at families income, because that's so important to paying bills today, not just that you have a job, but, you know, are you getting ahead? Are you falling behind?

Look at this chart. This shows the growth gap and the impact on families. Up to this date, the worst economic recovery that we had since World War II, a family, by now, would have gained back almost \$2,000 in disposable income, real income they can spend. Under the best recovery, they would have almost \$5,000 in their pocket. Just average, middle-of-the-road, C-grade recovery, nothing to talk about, a family ought to have now over \$3,500 more gained back in their paycheck.

But look what they have—\$461, and that's all, in the last 3½ years. That's what they've gained back, \$10 a month. So more families are being forced to go on food stamps. Those who have jobs are going nowhere in this recovery.

Let's look at Wall Street. The Federal Reserve is printing money right and left, buying our own debt, buying up credit, allocating, picking winners and losers around this country, continuing to pour money into the system.

So what's happened?

Let's put that family income against the Wall Street income. In this economic recovery, look at Wall Street. Look at the Standard & Poor's total return, look how high it is. It continues to grow.

But look at Main Street. Look at a per-person income, where it's gone over the last 3½ years. Again, almost nowhere.

If you like this economic recovery, if you like the fact that, as Wall Street roars, Main Street families are left behind, then don't change anything. Continue higher taxes, more stimulus spending, borrowing every dollar it seems that we spend.

You'll leave the President's health care law in place, put new regulations on Main Street, and this is what we'll get more of, families that continue to fall further and further behind, families who are looking for a job, and they either drop out completely and give up working, or they're forced onto food stamps, families that watch Wall Street grow wealthier as they gain what, \$10 a month in their paycheck?

The Republican budget changes the course of not just our financial position as a country, it changes the course for our economy, adding immediately 1 percent growth, closing that growth gap here in this first year, adding more income, \$1,500 to a family, and over the next 10 years, doing dramatically more, both for families and the economy.

That's what the Republicans' budget is about. It's about changing the growth gap, closing it, and giving our families a fighting chance again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY. I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from the

great State of Maryland, JOHN DELANEY, a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

And may I inquire how much time remains on our side?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman, prior to yielding the time, had 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague from New York for yielding me this time. And I also want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas for his leadership on the committee.

Too often, Mr. Chairman, we talk about our budget in absolute terms, and we don't talk to the American people about what budgets really are, which are choices. As we go through each line item of revenues and each line item of spending, we tend to characterize these things in very dramatic terms, as if any change, up or down, on any line of revenue or any line of spending, would have catastrophic implications.

We don't have an honest dialogue with the American people about what budgets really are, which are choices and statements of priorities, which is why, in my opinion, this Congress, and the administration, have failed to recognize the two dominant themes facing our country and our world right now.

□ 2030

The first is the fundamental need to change the fiscal trajectory of this country across the long term, and the second is the need to invest in our future and our children to prepare them for a world that is fundamentally changed because of globalization and technology.

We cannot do these two things—we cannot change the fiscal trajectory of this country and we cannot make investments in our future and our children—unless we do two things: first, reform the entitlement programs in this country; and, second, take actions to raise revenues.

Last year, 13 percent of the American population was over 65. In 2030, 20 percent of the American population will be over 65. This singular fact dominates our whole discussion around our fiscal future.

Just to put this into perspective, if we don't change the trajectory of our entitlement programs, in 10 years they will consume 70 percent of our spending and literally crowd out every other priority we have as a country. And just to put this in a sharper focus, right now, as a country, if you add up all the spending at the Federal, State, and local level on Americans over 65, that number is \$27,000 a year. If you do the same math on Americans under 18, that number is \$11,000 a year. That is a 2½ to 1 ratio of statements of priorities that we are making in our budget.

Just to be clear, I don't come here thinking we should spend less on the elderly. I don't come here thinking that we should be cutting taxes. I actually think we should be raising taxes.

But we fundamentally have to change the trajectory of entitlement spending in this country if we want to invest in our future.

Prior to coming to Congress, I spent two decades in the private sector. I started and led two companies that became New York Stock Exchange listed companies and, in the process, created several thousand jobs. That experience taught me two important lessons: first, we have to look at the facts, always; and, second, we have to think about the future, and we have to plan for the future.

I have already talked about the facts. Now I want to talk a little bit about the future.

If we want to create good jobs and reverse some of the trends that the gentleman from Texas just talked about and demonstrated to us, we have to make investments in making this country more competitive. That is the fundamental issue facing our country right now, Mr. Chairman, is to make this country more competitive.

To do that we have to do several things:

First, we have to continue to invest and reform our educational system. There has never been a stronger correlation in our country's history between having a good education and getting a job.

Second, we need a national energy policy to ensure that we have clean and inexpensive energy across the long-term. If you look at the history of successful economies, the two most important numbers are the cost of money and the cost of energy.

Third, we have to reform our immigration system.

Fourth, we have to invest in our infrastructure.

To do these things requires investments. We will fundamentally not be able to make these investments unless we, as I said, reform our entitlement programs and raise revenues.

We are confronted with two choices in our budgets, and these are insufficient choices. The American people deserve better. On one hand, we have a choice where we don't recognize the reality of where the entitlement programs are going, and the other choice is we slash and cut the critical investments we need to make to have a future. We can do better.

Each party likes to take the high ground on a balanced approach, but what does that really mean? To me, a balanced approach means several things.

First, we need additional revenues through measures like the Buffett rule, by closing certain corporate tax loopholes while also lowering corporate tax rates. The Buffett rule levels the playing field, does not raise rates, but it makes sure that there is parity in terms of taxes that are paid; and it will do a significant amount towards closing the income inequality gap in this country, and it will produce more revenues. That is the first thing we have to do.

The second thing, we do need to reform on entitlement programs, and we should do four things. We should means test; we should raise the cap; we should change how the cost of living adjustment is calculated; and we should change the retirement age, not for people who do manual labor, but for everyone else. That is the second thing we need to do.

The third thing we need to do is we need to look at our discretionary spending and our defense spending, and we need to make these expressions of our priorities around our future. Some of that will require additions; some of that will require subtractions.

These are things we need to do to have a balanced approach. This is the choice that this Congress should have, an approach that invests in our future and changes the fundamental trajectory of our entitlement programs while taking care of those most vulnerable. That, to me, is a balanced approach.

I am proud to be a Democrat. I am proud to be a Democrat because of our historical fight for those left behind and because of our view that we have to invest in our future. I would like my party to lead on fundamental reform to these entitlement programs, and do it now, so we don't have to affect current beneficiaries or people who are close to being beneficiaries. I want to take those savings with additional tax revenues and invest it in our future, invest it in our children, invest it in making this country more competitive so that we can create jobs that have a good standard of living.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, so I would be glad to reserve at this time so the former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee may close.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget has its priorities in the right place. It puts people and jobs first. The Democratic budget makes the numbers work for everyone by taking a balanced approach that includes not only cuts, but badly needed revenue. And the Democratic budget has a vision for the future that aspires to have this country lead the world in education, energy, innovation, and quality of life. It makes investments, and that means it takes some risks. But it also is a budget that confidently proclaims we are still the country of big dreams, high ideals, and limitless opportunities for everyone who is willing to work hard, play by the rules, and do their fair share.

I support the Democratic budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Congresswoman MALONEY, for her leadership, and continue to enjoy working with you on these economic issues.

Tonight, we have talked a lot about the growth gap and about the prospect

that America's future could be much dimmer. The truth is fiscal challenges facing our Nation are great, but they are not insurmountable if we are willing to take the necessary steps, if we are willing to be less popular, willing to do the right thing. As I said in my opening statement, the single most important thing we can do for families for America to start paying its bills as a government is to take the restrictor plate off our economy.

This recovery is substandard, the weakest since World War II. The growth gap is large and growing. The private sector jobs gap is large and growing. The gap in personal income for families is large and growing. We are adding more people to food stamps than we are getting jobs since the bottom of this recession.

That is no way to build a strong middle class. It is a formula for making people more dependent on the Federal Government. That may be some people's vision of America's future, but not ours.

So, if we are to change the future economic growth of America upside, if we are to increase economic growth in jobs and income growth, we need to restore the promise of economic opportunity in optimism. That is what the Republican budget does. It shrinks the Federal Government where it is fat and wasteful, and it grows the economy in ways that Americans can prosper. That is why the Republican budget is pro-growth and includes pro-growth tax reform, and it is key to a new era of American prosperity. It is a responsible balanced budget, which I strongly support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Budget Resolution, which balances the budget in 10 years.

We must get our fiscal house in order, and that starts with a plan to reduce spending responsibly—allowing to grow at 3.4 percent instead of 5 percent.

This budget cuts \$5.7 trillion in spending and reforms Medicare to save it for future generations while preserving the traditional model for those at or near retirement.

The Federal Government has to deal with the tough issues and make responsible decisions to restore balance.

I thank Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee for supporting key transportation initiatives in the resolution.

Transportation specific provisions:

House Budget Resolution supports MAP-21 funding levels until it expires at the end of 2014. MAP-21 reformed our Federal transportation programs by eliminating unneeded programs, streamlining the project approval process, and putting the highway trust fund on sound financial footing through 2014.

The budget resolution acknowledges that maintaining the long term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund and the tradition of the fund being user fee supported is a priority for the Congress as it begins to work on reauthorizing MAP-21.

Budget also contains language supporting the innovative financing mechanisms for trans-

portation included in MAP-21 such as public private partnerships and the TIFIA program.

I look forward to working with Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee, as we move the Nation toward fiscal responsibility and a growing economy.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Path to Prosperity—our House plan to balance the budget in ten years, restore our economy and grow jobs. As Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, I am particularly gratified to see this plan provide for our men and women in uniform and our national security by replacing deeply harmful sequestration cuts to our national defense with other commonsense reforms.

Since 9/11 our military has been operating at a very high operational tempo around the world keeping this country's citizens safe from those who seek to do us harm—from deadly attacks by al-Qaeda to the sabre rattling of Iran and nuclear provocations of North Korea. But back home as our economy slowed and our deficit rose, this Administration began to question our role in the world and called for substantial reductions to our national defense. While we agreed that everything should have been on the table in order to address this Nation's deficit spending, defense has represented only 18% of our national budget, while our military has absorbed 50% of the cuts to date.

Which is why it is so important today that House Republicans stand unified, both fiscal and national security conservatives, on the goal of replacing arbitrary, automatic across-the-board cuts to our military. This House Republican budget, as does its counterpart from the Republican Study Committee, provides \$560.2 billion in defense funding for fiscal year 2014. This is the amount my Committee called for in our views to Chairman RYAN, and an amount consistent with our military responsibilities. Over the next decade, we provide over \$6 trillion to fund our nation's defense. While this is significantly less than the levels in previous budget resolutions passed by the House, it is \$500 billion more than will be available under sequestration. It allows our military to execute the current national defense strategy and avoids the hollow force and unacceptable level of strategic and operational risk our commanders have warned us about in hearings before our Committee.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN for his unyielding dedication and belief in this country and in American exceptionalism. Absent his vision and absent this House budget, in just four short years, we will be paying more in interest on our debt than our national security. I urge members to support this budget and one of Congress's core constitutional responsibilities—to provide for our common defense.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budg-

et for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2040

COMPETING BUDGETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to address an empty House, but perhaps a few are watching C-SPAN.

We've just heard a fascinating 4-hour discussion on economic policy. A fundamental part of our work here in Congress is to set the economic policy for the United States. As we listened to that 4-hour debate and discussion, there were a lot of charts and a lot of economic theory on both sides: small government versus an active, investing government; the growth of taxes, or the lack thereof; a discussion about jobs and the like. I'd like to first start my discussion this evening on what we ought to be doing. That is the purpose of all of this.

I harken back to the 1930s, a period of time when the Nation was in a very serious Depression, unemployment was rampant, and there was a lot of pain and suffering throughout this Nation. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the President at the time. Today, we are in a somewhat better situation, but still there's a lot of pain, a lot of unemployment, and a lot of families in desperate situations. Back in the thirties, Franklin Delano Roosevelt put forth his New Deal. He articulated—at least a part of it—with what I call "The Test." He said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little.

That's a value statement. That's a statement about how he saw the role of government, and I agree with him.

Our task here today, as we debate tomorrow and the next 2 days what the economic policy of America will be, we ought to harken back to what Franklin D. Roosevelt said in the 1930s: "The test of our progress." "The test of our progress."

What are we to do? Are we to follow policies that would enrich the wealthy even more? And we have one such proposal before us; it's the Ryan Republican budget. It would slash the top tax rate from 39 percent to 25 percent and add another quarter of a million dollars of income annually to those who are making over 400—or over \$1 million a year. I think that goes counter to what Franklin Roosevelt said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much.

The remaining portion of that proposal by Mr. RYAN would put a greater burden on the working men and women and the poor, and it's done in two ways. One way is to remove those tax write-offs that the middle-income, that the working men and women have, significantly reducing those and cutting off those programs that people without jobs depend upon—from unemployment insurance to food stamps and to other benefits that they have—so much so that their actual tax burden would rise by somewhere between \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year. Franklin Roosevelt said the test of our progress is “whether we provide enough for those who have little.”

So if we are to believe that our role in government is to provide, to assist, to help, to bring up those who have little—the men and women who are unemployed, the families that have lost their homes, those who are searching for a well-paying job—if that is the test of our progress, if that is our value and our purpose, then I think we'd better think about a different economic policy than is presented to us by the Republicans. I would like to spend some time discussing that this evening.

First of all, there's an immediate situation in which the sequestration—which I have voted repeatedly to end, and many of my colleagues have also—is inherent in the Republican proposal. That sequestration will bring pink slips to 750,000 Americans in this year, the 2013 year; 750,000 Americans will lose their jobs. So if the test of our progress is to help those who have little, well, the Republican budget adds 750,000 people to those who will have very little. They would lose their job.

So why would we do this? Why would we do any economic policy that would add 750,000 people to the unemployment rolls? It makes no sense if you want to grow the economy. If you want to reduce your tax revenues and increase your deficit, I suppose this is one way to do it, but it's not a very good way.

I will tell you that in my district, at Travis Air Force Base, where men and women are going to lose their jobs, where 20 percent of their pay will be cut, it's a very serious problem for our Nation's defense. Because from that Air Force base, the big C-5As and the C-17s that carry men and women and equipment across this globe to fight our wars, to protect our Nation, they will be sitting on the ground. They will not be doing their training. They will not be prepared to carry out their task in defending this Nation.

Why would we do that? It makes no sense to me. Whether it has to do with the test of our progress or our values or our Nation's defense, why would we want to move a policy that would send 750,000 people through the unemployment lines? It makes no sense to me at all.

I was home in my district this last weekend and I was talking to some elderly people that attended one of my meetings. They were asking me, Is it true that you guys are going to cut

Medi-Cal?—which is the Medicaid program in California. I said, No, not us guys; but, yes, there is a proposal in Congress to seriously cut Medicaid, and therefore Medi-Cal. They said, Don't they understand that that's how my husband is supported in the nursing home? What are we to do if those cuts force him out of the nursing home?

Well, the reality is that that could happen, because we have a budget on the floor that 435 of us will be voting on in the next couple of days that actually will reduce the Medicaid—and, therefore, Medi-Cal in California—by a third, a third cut. Therefore, that lady who was concerned about her husband's care in the nursing home will find a problem.

□ 2050

She and perhaps many, many others—not perhaps, definitely—many other senior citizens are going to find their opportunity to have care in a nursing home removed. It's a very serious issue because who are those people that are going to see their Medi-Cal, or across this Nation, Medicaid support significantly reduced by one-third? Well, here they are. Two-thirds of them are seniors and people with disabilities. We're not talking about welfare and all that goes with that. We're talking about seniors and men and women in this Nation that have such disabilities that they cannot care for themselves. These are the people that are going to be hurt. Another 20 percent of them are children.

Why? Why would this House vote for a budget that would harm seniors, the disabled and children? Why would we do that? Perhaps the argument that you heard over the last 4 hours is, well, we need to deal with the deficit. Yes, we do. But do we need to deal with it in this way, that we go after seniors, we go after people with disabilities that cannot care for themselves and children and take it to them? And at the very same time in the very same piece of legislation give the superwealthy an additional, extraordinarily large amount of money that the average worker in the United States would have to work 5 to 6 years to equal the tax reduction given to those who are earning a million dollars? And for those that are earning a billion dollars, it is add three to four more zeros to their tax reduction.

Why would we do that? It makes no sense. It is not the American value. It's not what FDR said should be the test of our progress—seniors, children and disabled. Why would we do that?

When you look at that budget and you look at that proposal a little more, what do you see? The seniors, not those who are in nursing homes without income, but seniors, the average senior. The average senior in the United States has a median annual income of \$22,800—median. Half of the seniors in this Nation have an annual income of less than \$22,800. Half of them have more than that.

So where are we with the proposal that we'll be voting on in the next couple of days from our Republican colleagues? It is a proposal that will end the Medicare program as we know it, and all Americans who are not yet 55 years of age will never see the Medicare guarantee that is available to those Americans that are now 65 and 55 years or older, the Medicare guarantee of a health care program that has, since its inception in 1964, taken nearly all of the seniors in this Nation out of poverty when together with Social Security.

Before there was Medicare in 1964, there was rampant poverty among seniors. I've said on this floor before, and I'll say it again tonight, one of the searing memories in my mind was a trip when my father took me to the county hospital in Calaveras County in the 1950s to visit my neighbor, a rancher, who could no longer take care of himself. He didn't have the money, he was poor, and he wound up in the county hospital. There was a ward, perhaps 20 seniors in the worst possible condition without adequate medical care, simply lined up bed to bed to die.

What are we doing here? What are we doing? Why would we set up a program to end one of the most important, valuable programs to every American citizen? That is the promise of Medicare, a comprehensive medical program for them to take care of their health in their senior years. Why would we end that and turn it over to the health insurance industry?

Now, I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years. I know the health insurance industry, and I know their number one purpose: it's profit. They continually will put profit before people, and yet the proposal that is given to us by the Republican majority is to take every American under the age of 55 and give them a voucher so that they can go to those rapacious health insurance companies and try to get an adequate health insurance policy.

The guarantees that are in the Affordable Care Act would be wiped out by their legislation. The guarantees of an adequate insurance program, the end of discrimination based upon age and preexisting conditions, gone, wiped out. What are they thinking? What are they thinking? Do they understand what the American senior is going through? I think not. I think not. When you consider who those seniors are, I don't understand. I do not understand.

Now, there's an alternative, there's an alternative put forward by our Democrats on this side. You've heard it discussed here in the previous 4 hours. It is an equivalent that is a reflection of the basic American value of taking care of each other, of helping each other, the value of a community, a small community perhaps like I live in in California, the community of Walnut Grove, or the large community of all of us, over 300 million Americans, where we care for each other, where we

test our progress by making sure that all of us are lifted up, not just the superwealthy, not just those who have everything they could possibly need—I understand they may want more—but rather to provide the basic needs of these who have nothing or little—health care, food, shelter, and clothing.

That's where we're coming from. We do it in a way that actually reduces the deficit over time, brings back into a reasonable balance the annual appropriations and the revenues of this government, does it in a way that meets the needs of this generation and future generations, does it in a way that makes the critical investments that grow the economy, rather than stifle the economy by pulling out of the economy, as our Republican colleagues would, the essential elements of economic growth.

There are five of them. I've talked about this for more than 25 years in California and beyond. Those critical investments in present and future economic growth are simple, but they are powerful, and they are absolutely necessary. They are education, research, infrastructure, manufacturing—making things here in America—and change. Those are the five elements. And now that we're here at the Federal level, we must add to that our Nation's security, defense and others.

Let me put a couple of things up here. Growing the economy: growing the economy requires that we invest in infrastructure. This is both immediate and long term.

□ 2100

When we invest in infrastructure, we put people to work now. We can do this. Men and women and companies and contractors are ready to go to work. The skilled labor force is there. All they need is for this government to fund a substantial infrastructure program, and that's precisely what the Democratic budget does. It adds \$50 billion now to the appropriations for this year and creates an infrastructure bank so that we can have a public-private partnership to build those infrastructure programs that have a cash flow: sanitation projects, water projects, toll bridges, toll roads, airports. Many of the infrastructure programs that this Nation desperately needs can be financed with an infrastructure bank. For those that cannot be financed with a public-private partnership, we can and we must use our general fund revenue to build the infrastructure.

For every dollar we invest in infrastructure, we immediately return to the economy \$1.57. Don't take my word for it. Take Mark Zandi's word, an economist for Moody's Analytics.

Nobody has debated that point. So why don't we invest in the infrastructure? When we do so, we will be safer. We'll have safer airports; our roads will be safer, they'll be paved; and the potholes, not all will disappear, but over time. We will improve our highway sys-

tem. And our bridges, many of which are deemed to be insufficient and unsafe, can be repaired and rebuilt. And in the process, we've laid the foundation for future economic growth.

On the education side, it is exactly the same. On the education side, if we educate our children, if we have the best education program in the world, something very good will happen to this Nation. First, we will be competitive.

If we fail to educate our workforce, there is no way that we can be competitive. Yet, the budget being proposed by our Republican majority slashes the education programs in this Nation. And for those who are in college or have graduated, they would double the interest rates on student loans. What are they thinking?

On the other hand, our Democratic budget would actually increase funding this year for education, keeping teachers in the classroom, giving schools the opportunity to improve. In the infrastructure program, there are facilities and the opportunity in higher education to continue to keep students in school.

For those who need additional training in the work programs, the Workforce Investment program would be augmented, and we would be able to provide the upgrade in skills and education for those who are unemployed so that they would have a chance to get a job in a growing economy. We envision a growing economy where jobs are created. We know that this year the difference between the budget that we're proposing and the budget that our Republican colleagues are proposing is a difference of 1.2 million jobs.

With the continuation of the sequestration, 750,000 jobs will be lost. We end that. That's 750,000 on the plus side. And with the investments in education and infrastructure, we would add another 400,000 to 500,000 jobs. That's 1.2 million jobs. There's a big difference here: Americans going back to work and Americans being laid off.

We also know that the future economy demands that this Nation become and continue to be the most aggressive, robust research Nation in the world. We are today. No one, no other country, no other university in any other country can match the research that's done in the United States. It is that research that has kept this economy ahead, has kept us moving forward, yet here again we see a departure in how to grow this economy, how to create jobs.

Our budget, our proposal would continue to fund the research programs and, in fact, augment them more than what is currently available in today's appropriations. On the other hand, there are slashes to the research budget.

Today, farmers from my district, today researchers at the University of California at Davis, today the head of the Northern California Resource Conservation District organization came to my office and said, We need your

help. We need your help to deal with a very real problem in California. Over the years for a variety of reasons, the aquifers, the underground water tables of California have been contaminated with nitrates, nitrates from the farm, nitrates from fertilizer, dairies and the rest.

There is a requirement, in fact a necessity, to reduce that contamination and, in fact, to eliminate it. However, in order to do so, fundamental research in the way in which plants take up nitrogen needs to be undertaken so that the nitrogen fertilizer that is applied to the fields matches the amount of nitrogen that the plants actually need. And that varies from soil condition to soil condition. Yet, in the budget that's been proposed by our Republican colleagues, there is a \$45 million diminution, reduction in the available research money at the University of California at Davis, critical research needed by farmers so that they don't unnecessarily fertilize their fields, so that they accurately match the needs of their plants to the amount of fertilizer they apply. In so doing, they reduce the contamination that is a serious health problem in many parts of California.

Which path do we go on? Do we invest in energy research critical to this Nation? It was, in fact, past research conducted by the United States Government, the U.S. Geological Survey and the Department of Energy that created the knowledge and the techniques for fracking, which has opened up a vast resource through this Nation, a gas resource, natural gas resources, as well as oil.

Research is fundamental: energy research, agricultural research, research in health care, research in the way in which we conduct our communications system. All of these things are fundamental, yet a choice will be made in the next few days which path we go on.

The fourth point I wanted to make is this: Manufacturing. Manufacturing matters. Manufacturing is where the middle class is. Manufacturing is where we built the great American middle class, making things, cars, refrigerators and the more advanced things such as high-speed trains and the like. We need to return this Nation to a manufacturing Nation. This is the creation of wealth. Using research, new products, new technologies, new ways in which we can make things, advanced manufacturing technology, we can rebuild the great American manufacturing sector.

We lost 9 million manufacturing jobs in the last 20 to 25 years. America can't afford that. We need tax policies. We need policies that encourage manufacturing in the United States. It was 2½ years ago that we passed legislation that eliminated many of the tax breaks that corporations had to offshore jobs. We need to finish that job. The President said clearly in his State of the Union message we need to provide tax breaks for on-shoring, bringing those

jobs back to America, and end the remaining tax breaks that corporations get for off-shoring. In so doing, we build our economy and we help to balance the budget by bringing tax revenues back to this Nation.

□ 2110

Manufacturing matters. Billions of dollars of our tax money are spent every year on goods and services, many of which are not made in America.

Why in the world would we spend our tax dollars on steel that's manufactured in China to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge? This is 43 million tons of steel, maybe 3,000 to 6,000 jobs in China, not in the United States—American tax money spent. It goes on and on. We need a strong Make It in America, Buy It in America policy so that our tax money is spent on American-made products and services, not on foreign made. Now, if you want to spend your own money out there, fine—buy whatever you want to buy—but if you're going to spend American taxpayer money, then we should spend that money on American-made equipment.

That is precisely the policy that we are offering here in the United States as we move our infrastructure programs forward and as we move forward with our energy development—our solar and our wind and other advanced energy systems. It is to use our tax money to build American manufacturing, once again, here in our Nation. So manufacturing matters, and we will Make It in America when, once again, it is made in America. It is very fundamental.

So these are the things: education, infrastructure, research, manufacturing, and change. We have to be willing to change in many, many of our policies.

How can we pay for this? Here is one novel idea. We can end those tax breaks that are given to individuals and to corporations that are no longer necessary.

The oil industry over the last decade earned \$1 trillion in profit. This is the Big Five. It's not all the small ones. It would be much higher if you added the small ones. We are in the midst of an energy boom right now—oil, natural gas. We are producing more energy of natural gas and oil than we have in the last two or three decades. Also, the oil companies are doing pretty well, yet they continue to receive billions of dollars a year—perhaps as much as \$5 billion, \$4 billion for the Big Five in the oil industry—of your tax money to support them as their profits have added up to over \$1 trillion. This is just the Big Five in the last decade.

Why would we do that? Why would we continue to use our tax money to support the oil industry? They get enough at the pump from us. They don't need a tax break. Let's take that tax break, turn it around and put it into tomorrow's energy systems, into supporting the green technologies—the

solar, the wind, the conservation programs, the electric car systems, the batteries that will power those systems in the future—as we transition our economy from where we were to where we must be in the future. That's just one example of the tax breaks that are not necessary, and there are numerous other ones.

Why would we give Wall Street hedge fund billionaires an additional tax break where their real income—I mean, not capital gains, but their earned income—is taxed at capital gains rates rather than at an income tax rate? Why would we do that? We should end those kinds of tax breaks that are not necessary for economic growth and shift that money into deficit reduction or into assisting those future industries that we need to have or, perhaps, into research or education.

These are all strategies for the future, and they affect my communities that I represent. The infrastructure programs are crucial to my communities. I represent 200 miles of the Sacramento River. The second-most flood prone part of this Nation, the second-most at-risk cities in this Nation are in my district.

One proposal would reduce the infrastructure money needed to upgrade the levees to provide the protection for human life and property. Another proposal is to invest in infrastructure. One proposal is to cause layoffs and to take out those civil servants who are working in the Army Corps of Engineers and to say, For 20 percent of the time, you're going to be furloughed; you're not going to work. So the Army Corps of Engineers' work necessary to design, to oversee and to push forward the projects that I need in my district in order to protect my citizens will be delayed. It will be delayed through the next storm season.

We pray we won't have a flood, but why should we even have to pray when our proposal on the Democratic side would fully fund those civilians in the Army Corps of Engineers who are necessary to push forward the projects to protect Sacramento, to protect Marysville, to protect Yuba City, and to provide the money—the Federal share of the cost—of rebuilding and upgrading those levees? I'm not the only place in this Nation that is faced with that. We saw recently Superstorm Sandy, and we know the horrible impact that that had on New Jersey, New York, and the surrounding areas. We need to rebuild. We need to put that infrastructure in place because we know there will be additional superstorms in the future.

We are looking at a fundamental policy here, a fundamental question of our values as Americans. Are we going to have an investment strategy that grows the American economy and puts people back to work and protects Americans? Whether they are poor or impoverished, whether they are children or seniors, are we going to put in place policies that meet their basic

needs? And for those future seniors, will they have the promise of Medicare? That is a question before the House of Representatives that in the next 3 days will be answered.

I pray and I work with my colleagues to see to it that we have a growth agenda, that we have an agenda of jobs, that we have an agenda to care for those who have little, and that we honor this value:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my remaining time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business traveling with the President to Israel.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and March 18 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HARPER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a home emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

751. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

752. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting results of a meeting of the Economic Adjustment Committee to consider additional funding sources for the Defense Access Roads program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

753. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General George J. Flynn, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ex Parte Cease and Desist and Summary Seizure Orders-Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements (RIN: 1210-AB48) received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

755. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Filings Required of Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements and Certain Other Related Entities (RIN: 1210-AB51) received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

756. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran", pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 68513(a) Public Law 112-81, section 1245(d)(4); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

757. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2012 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0700; FRL-9788-6] received March 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirement for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0237; FRL-9787-6] received March 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

760. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy Labeling Rule (RIN: 3084-AB15) received March 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List [Docket No.: 121219726-2726-01] (RIN: 0694-AF85) received March 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

762. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2012 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

763. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the District's Workforce Development Programs"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

764. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Small and Local Business Development's Fiscal Year 2011 Performance Accountability Report"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

765. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2011, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

766. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a

copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2012, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

767. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Residential, Business, and Wind and Solar Resource Leases on Indian Land (RIN: 1076-AE73) received March 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

768. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Courts of Indian Offenses [Docket ID: BIA-2013-0001] (RIN: 1076-AF16) received March 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

769. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Standards of Identity for Distilled Spirits [Docket No.: TTB-2012-0002; T.D. TTB-112; Ref: Notice No. 127] (RIN: 1513-AB33) received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

770. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Work Opportunity Tax Credit Transition Relief [Notice 2013-14] received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 127. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth District of Texas (Rept. 113-22). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. COTTON):

H.R. 1244. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility to school food authorities in meeting certain nutritional requirements for the school lunch and breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1245. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require that individuals seeking training in the operation of certain aircraft be checked against the terrorist watchlist to ensure that such individuals are non-threats to aviation; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1246. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide that the District of Columbia Treasurer or one of the Deputy Chief Financial Officers of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District

of Columbia may perform the functions and duties of the Office in an acting capacity if there is a vacancy in the Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1247. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to support crop insurance for specialty crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr.

TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JONES, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. YODER, Mr. BARR, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 1248. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 1249. A bill to amend section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants, similar retail food establishments, and vending machines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FARR, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LONG, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1250. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants with minority serving institutions for the purpose of establishing verified delivery systems to address social and academic problems facing veterans enrolled at such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1252. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1253. A bill to prohibit foreign assistance to Pakistan until the tuition assistance program of the Department of Defense is fully funded; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 1254. A bill to repeal a requirement that new employees of certain employers be automatically enrolled in the employer's health benefits plan; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1255. A bill to enable Federal and State chartered banks and thrifts to meet the credit needs of the Nation's home builders, and to provide liquidity and ensure stable credit for meeting the Nation's need for new homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1256. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to jointly adopt rules setting forth the application to cross-border swaps transactions of certain provisions relating to swaps that were enacted as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 1257. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SIREN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SABLON):

H.R. 1258. A bill to strengthen communities through English literacy and civics education for new Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 1259. A bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1260. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RAN-

GEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BASS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1261. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish fair and transparent practices related to the marketing and provision of overdraft coverage programs at depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1262. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to provide guidance and limitations regarding the integration of unmanned aircraft systems into United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 1263. A bill to increase access to community behavioral health services for all Americans and to improve Medicaid reimbursement for community behavioral health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1264. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for the District of Columbia under the Medicaid Program to 75 percent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1265. A bill to require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1266. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, concerning the calculation of transactions for the lease of land ports of entry and international bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1267. A bill to delay and phase-in increases in flood insurance premium rates under the national flood insurance program for certain properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for qualified flood mitigation expenses incurred with respect to certain residences for which the chargeable premium rate under the national flood insurance program is increasing and to provide increased funding for mitigation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RADEL (for himself, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1269. A bill to prohibit the use of lethal military force against citizens of the United States located within the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ROBY (for herself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GRIF-FIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 1270. A bill to provide for greater transparency and honesty in the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax as an incentive to partner with educational institutions to provide skills training for students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 1272. A bill to support State and tribal government efforts to promote research and education related to maple syrup production, natural resource sustainability in the maple syrup industry, market promotion of maple products, and greater access to lands containing maple trees for maple-sugaring activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 1273. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to reauthorize and improve the Rural Energy for America Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1274. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COOK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to Sergeant Rafael Peralta; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. CAROLYN B.

MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GERLACH):

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution supporting the formation of a bipartisan Presidential Commission to study the establishment of a National Museum of the American People; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 127. A resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth District of Texas; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. STIVERS):

H. Res. 128. A resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H. Res. 129. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should not pass any legislation that would tax or confiscate personal savings accounts, including retirement accounts such as Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs) and 401k plans, certificates of deposit (CDs), or other personal savings to provide financial relief for private businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 1248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 1249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare) and Clause 3 (Commerce)

'Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare'

'Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate Commerce'

The Medicare Audit Improvement Act makes several changes to the way hospital audits are conducted which involves at least three parties: a hospital, a private Medicare contractor who conducts audits and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. During the auditing process, transactions take place between these parties which is what constitutes this bill as regulating commerce. Further, Medicare is considered to be constitutional as part of providing for the general welfare and therefore any changes to Medicare would fall under this provision as well.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:

H.R. 1251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 1252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 1254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United

States"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; and

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 the Commerce Clause

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 1265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this legislation is Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 12.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. RADEL:

H.R. 1269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18;

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 1270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the power of Congress in regards to appropriations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 7, Clause 1, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 (Bills of Revenue):

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills."

Article I, Section 8 (Enumerated Powers of Congress):

"The Congress shall have power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 9 (Limits on Congress):

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

AND

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power * * * to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 61: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 104: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 118: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 147: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 175: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 176: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 183: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 258: Mr. KILMER, Mr. MARINO, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 292: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 311: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 321: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 324: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MICA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RADEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YODER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 335: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 346: Mr. MESSER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 357: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 360: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 375: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 385: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 392: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 401: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 449: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 452: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 460: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 474: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 483: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 493: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 503: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 507: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 523: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 525: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 527: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 540: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 543: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 567: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 569: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 570: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 574: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 578: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 580: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 582: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 594: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 627: Ms. CHU, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 630: Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 631: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 634: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 637: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 647: Mr. MESSER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 649: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 659: Mr. REED.

H.R. 664: Mr. REED.

H.R. 666: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 683: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 685: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 688: Mr. PETRI, Ms. MENG, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 693: Mr. STEWART and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 714: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 721: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 724: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 736: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 742: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 755: Mr. PETRI and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 761: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 763: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 766: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 772: Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 783: Mr. FARR and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 800: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 811: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 813: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LYNCH, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 818: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 824: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 833: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 836: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 850: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 896: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 900: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 903: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 918: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 920: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 924: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 927: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 940: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 955: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 958: Mr. KILMER and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 961: Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 963: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 968: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 974: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 986: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 990: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 992: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 999: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1003: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1005: Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

H.R. 1015: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1020: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1024: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1026: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATTA and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1033: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1038: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1039: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1040: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1063: Mr. COLE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1072: Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1093: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SHEA-POR-TER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1094: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1096: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1097: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1102: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. BERA of California, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1108: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1123: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1130: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1138: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1144: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1146: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1179: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1201: Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1204: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1209: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HALL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1220: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1223: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1242: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 20: Ms. NORTON.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. COOPER and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. ROKITA and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 10: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 30: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 31: Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 36: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. DESANTIS.

H. Res. 51: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 71: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 76: Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 90: Mr. FARR, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LEWIS.

H. Res. 100: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 104: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 126: Mr. LANCE.